

TED KACZYNSKI
to

BEAU FRIEDLANDER

Item #29

Certified

Article # Z 403 256 236

January 6, 1999

Dear Beau,

I write in answer to your letter of December 29.

P.1, #3. I certainly will consult you regarding any books I might like to publish, and in fact I'll let you publish them, if you want to, as long as things go as well between us as they have until now. I'll also consult you about any articles I might want to publish if I feel that their subject-matter overlaps in any way with that of Truth versus Lies. When I can find time to write them, I may begin submitting some articles to small, radical periodicals, but these will have no relation to the material covered in Truth versus Lies, and it would probably be more trouble than it would be worth, both for you and for me, if I consulted you about all of them. In any case, the radical periodicals in question probably have such small circulation that they couldn't compete with you to any measurable extent.

To explain further my reasons for being cautious, In my position I ~~am~~ am helpless and able to do very little for myself. I have to depend on people on the outside to do things for me, and this restricts my autonomy. The fact that I allowed ~~myself~~ myself to become too dependent on my defense team was part of the reason why my lawyers were able to control me as much as they did and take over my case.

So, in the future, I want to retain as much autonomy as I can under the circumstances, and avoid becoming any more dependent on any one than I have to. Thus far our relations have been excellent, and you've been more cooperative than I would ~~be~~ ever have hoped that a publisher would be. But, of course, there is no 100% guarantee that our relations will continue to be excellent indefinitely.

p.1, #4. As far as I am concerned, you have a completely free hand regarding the inclusion of photographs in the book. Except, of course, that I think it would be premature to contact my brother and mother just yet.

p.1, #5. As I think I've indicated earlier, I'm no longer worried about the risk that Context might go bankrupt, so you don't have to inconvenience yourself on that score.

p.2, #5. I never requested Mike to excise my letters from his book. I only withdrew temporarily my permission for use of the letters as a kind of slap on the wrist to you and Mike because I was seriously annoyed at your having given the ms. to Vicki Gordon.

You now request approval of your use of four passages from my letters. The only draft of Mello's book that I have is the one dated October 30. In it I can find the two passages that you cite as being on p. 26 and p. 107, respectively. I can't find the other two, so I don't know just what it is that you want to

quote. But you have my permission to use the passages on p.26 and p.107, and it is highly probable that I will give you permission to use the other two passages too. However, this is subject to a qualification: I'd like you to clear these passages with Professor Bonnie before you commit yourself to using them. If Bonnie can't review them in time to meet your deadline, then you can just go ahead and use them. In a phone conversation I had with Bonnie on Dec. 29 I understood him to say that he didn't want anything quoted from my letters that would have a bearing on my motivations, so he may have objections to some of what you want to quote.

But what happened to that January 7 deadline? You certainly won't receive this letter until well after Jan. 7.

P. 2, ¶ 4. I can easily explain the mysterious phone call you received by quoting from my letter of Dec. 10, 1998 to Steven Fischler:

"Since you seem to be quite knowledgeable about everything that pertains to the media, I wonder whether you can give me any information about Beau Friedlander of Context Media (in New York City) who is going to publish my book. I emphasize that I have not found the slightest reason to doubt Mr. Friedlander's honesty, and would like to have information about him only as a precaution (since some others who at first appeared perfectly honest

eventually turned out to be otherwise)."

That's the sum total of everything I've told Fischler about you. It was his own idea to call you, and he did so without my prior knowledge.

Fischler reported back to me that he found no information about you apart from the little he learned from the phone call. Fischler, by the way, has a copy of Truth versus Lies, which I sent him a long time ago, maybe even before I sent the ms. to you.

I also asked the woman whom I consulted about the contract to check up on you, and she too reported that she found no information, but she added that you couldn't be one of the bad exploiters (of authors), otherwise she would already have heard of you. She has a very ~~new~~ negative opinion of Regnery, so she's one of the reasons why I chose you instead of him.

I find it useful to ask my various correspondents to check up on one another.

*

I expect to meet Bonnie for the first time the day after tomorrow, and I expect that the meeting will prove interesting.

I hope that all goes well with you and that your business continues to thrive vigorously.

Best regards,

Ted

P.S. Regarding your suggestion that I should write an article in ~~the~~ rebuttal of Waits's book (which suggestion you made during our Dec. 24 phone conversation): I would need information about the expected length and format of the article, and it would be well for me to have a copy of the periodical before I begin writing.

-TK

[#30]

TED KACZYNSKI
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

Jan. 10, 1979

Dear Beau,

Since Bonnie can't make up his mind whether or not he is going to file a motion for me, I don't any longer feel that I need to delay the publication of Truth vs Lies to suit his convenience. Send me the new contract, and if it's satisfactory (as it probably will be, I'll sign it. You can then move ahead with publication as soon as you please.

Best regards,

Ted

TED KACZYNSKI
to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

Item #31

January 14, 1999

Dear Beau,
Regarding Alston Chase — see the enclosed copy of a letter that I've sent him. If Chase asks you for permission to quote from my book in his book, you're at liberty to give him that permission if you like. I take no position as to whether he should be given such permission or not. Any ~~negotiation~~ negotiation on that subject is between you and him, and anything that you two decide will be alright with me.

*

Regarding Waits's book — Two ~~pe~~ different people have told me that Waits has made a certain claim that is a whopping lie and should be easy to disprove. I just have to get solid confirmation that he did make this claim, and then someone has to challenge him to produce the evidence he claims to have. If he doesn't produce it, that fact will expose him to great suspicion, and if he does produce it, it should be easy to prove he's a liar.

The only trouble is that for somewhat arcane legal reasons, it might be risky for me to discuss this evidence myself at present, but I think a lawyer could deal with this matter for me without exposing me to risk. However, since I have more-or-less fired Bonnie, and since he had told me he was too busy to give much time to my case anyway, the only lawyers I have now who might handle this matter for me are Quin Denvir and Judy Clarke. I'm

asking them to deal with it, but they too are busy and I don't know how much time they'll be able to spend on it.

However that may be, I've worked ~~myself~~ through the first 46 pages of Waits's book, making notes on the majority of the false statements as I go, and, luckily for me, it appears that Waits is a clumsy liar. Anyone who might make a thorough study of the documents in my case should find Waits's account implausible. Unfortunately, for legal reasons, this is not the time to make the documents public.

However, I've found several inaccuracies that can be proved without recourse to the documents. The ~~majority~~ majority of these Waits might pass off as honest mistakes, but a few are provable lies. The best of these occurs on p 36, where Waits says that an aluminum pipe ran through the wall of my cabin to my garden. No such pipe existed, and it should be easy to get proof of this. Since Waits ~~says~~ ^{indicates} he saw the pipe himself, this could hardly be an ^{honest} mistake on his part. This provides proof that Waits was lying when he says he saw my cabin when I was still living in it. He apparently visited my land after the cabin was gone, but it's clear he never saw the cabin in its place on my land, else he could not have made that mistake about the pipe.

*

Now here's what I think I want to do about the Waits problem. In the first place,

I don't want to make a mountain out of a molehill by publishing any sort of detailed enumeration of the falsehoods in Waits's book. Ideally I would like to identify just a few provable lies of Waits's that, when made public, would be sufficient to show him up as a liar. (As indicated above, I already have one such provable lie, if I can get Quin and Judy to do the necessary investigative work.)

~~Also, I think you're right when you say~~

Also, — and I think you will agree with this — I think it's unnecessary to publish a rebuttal in any periodical of national circulation unless Waits's book gets national attention. However, I do think I have to publish a rebuttal that will reach the same market that Waits's book will reach. I could accomplish this by sending a letter to the editor of the Missoulian (there's the Western Montana market). Waits's book will also be read nationwide ~~the~~ by people who take a special interest in my case, such as the Internet groupies and certain kinds of anarchists. I should be able to reach this market by publishing something in a small, radical periodical such as the Earth First! Journal, or Green Anarchist.

But there's another market that will be exposed to Waits's book. Rick Sallinger has visited Lincoln and has interviewed Waits and my neighbors, and the . . . He is probably going to do a TV news piece on the

Waits book. But in his letter to me, of Jan. 7, Sallinger expressed great skepticism about Waits's claims.

Now I know that you found Sallinger an unpleasant person when you talked to him, and you found he was motivated by self-interest. Of course, in my opinion the only safe assumption is that any media person is motivated by self-interest. But I think Sallinger's self-interest can prove useful to us.

In the first place, it's in his interest to play straight with us, because by providing him with information (and possibly very brief interviews) we can make ourselves very useful to him, and he won't want to throw that away by screwing us. In the second place, he seems disposed to investigate this Waits affair and is apparently very skeptical of Waits's claims. And it seems fairly clear to me that he can make a bigger splash and better promote his career as a journalist by broadcasting a piece that endeavors to sort out the truth from the lies, than by simply touting Waits's book ~~or~~ or by just putting me down as everyone else has done.

So I think it is to our advantage to help and encourage Sallinger to investigate Waits and his book. (Without, of course, giving him more information than is necessary for that purpose.) Thus, I propose to write to Sallinger and give him some relevant information, and I'm going to ask Quin and Judy to cooperate with him --

cautiously and only for the purpose of investigating Waits. If you're ever in touch with Sallinger again, I would appreciate it if you would be polite to him. You can give him info related to Waits or his book to the extent you think it's safe. I don't mind if you tell him you're publishing my book, but don't tell him anything about the content.

I'm also going to tell Sallinger about Michael Mello's book. There should be no harm in that since the fact that Michael is publishing such a book has already been made public. If Sallinger wants to interview Michael about the book, that's fine with me. I would have no objection to Sallinger's seeing the manuscript, since that has now been "censored".

Please let me know what you think about all this. I'll be glad to have your comments.

Here's the name and address of someone at Lincoln with whom I've been corresponding. I don't remember whether I've given you this info before, but anyway it's

Whenever you want any info about Waits or about Lincoln affairs in general, you'll find her very useful.

Best regards,

Ted

TED KACZYNSKI
to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

January 21, 1999

Item # 33.
Certified, Article #
Z 403 256 523

Dear Beau,

I received the two copies of the contract just yesterday. The contract looks fine to me, so I've signed it (both copies) and ~~was~~ am returning it to you in this envelope. Bonnie wanted me to wait until the contract had been reviewed by Kenyon and Kenyon, but I want to move ahead with this, so what the heck. If Kenyon and Kenyon thinks something should be changed, I don't doubt that we can work it out. The only changes I've made have been corrections of two misprints, on pages 2 and 9 respectively.

I received a phone call yesterday from Professor Bonnie. He told me that he had just received my letter in which I told him I was offering Mr. Buttrey the position of lead counsel, and he informed me that he hadn't meant ~~it~~ what he said when he told me I might end up having to file my §2255 motion pro se. (He did not, however, explain why he said it if he didn't mean it.) He gave me absolute assurance that I would not have to file the motion pro se. He also said he had talked with Mr. Buttrey and explained to him what had happened and told him there might possibly be a role for him (Buttrey) to play later on. He said that Buttrey was "happy with that," whatever that means.

This incident leaves me feeling very uneasy.

Today I telephoned Buttrey's office. He wasn't in, but I left a message for him to the effect that I would like to communicate with him directly on this subject and hear his side of the story. (I told him I had not explicitly reinstated Bonnie as my legal representative, so that he [Buttrey] could communicate with me directly rather than through Bonnie.) There are obvious reasons why it's to my advantage to be represented by Bonnie (his expertise, his contacts), but I don't want to be put in the position of going back on my word and withdrawing an offer when there's no fault on the part of the person to whom I made it.

Oh, well, at least this incident has the advantage that it gave me an excuse to say that I was going to go ahead with publication of the book without waiting for Bonnie's approval. Bonnie told me on the phone that he still wants to review the book, but that he will meet any deadlines that you may set. So you can just go ahead with publication of Truth vs Lies.

*

Thanks for your note about the damaged letters. The fact that you received an unsealed envelope is the fault of the mailroom staff here. I have to hand over all mail unsealed (except letters to attorneys) so that it can be read before being ~~is~~ given to the Post Office. The envelopes are supposed to be sealed for me — but correctional institutions are not noted

JANUARY 21, 1999]

for efficiency.

*

Thanks for the copy of Chris Waits's book. Please thank Michael Ulveman for me and give him my regards. Also, you might ask him if he would be interested in ~~investigating~~ helping to investigate Waits's veracity. There are certain claims that Waits makes that should be checked out, and I can point some of these out to Ulveman. Waits is a clumsy hoaxer, but he is also a rather colorful one, and Ulveman possibly could produce an entertaining article on the subject.

Please keep me posted on any information you get from lawyers about possible legal action that could be taken against Waits or his publishers.

Meanwhile, my plan, at least tentatively, is this:

I've gone through Waits's book, making notes, and I've identified a number of points at which Waits is vulnerable, i.e., at which it can be shown that he is lying. In some cases the lies can be exposed only with the help of documents that the lawyers tell me I should not yet make public; but in other cases such documents are not required. There are other points at which Waits is possibly or probably lying, but this cannot be shown without information that can be obtained only through investigation.

So I expect to write to the Helena Independent

Record and Montana Magazine (the publishers), and tell them they've been had. I will offer them a few points in proof that Waits is a liar, then I will invite them to investigate Waits and his book to determine whether the latter is a hoax. I will offer them my full cooperation in this investigation. I will point out that if they investigate Waits and conclude he's a liar, it will be embarrassing to them to admit publicly that they were taken in by a hoaxer; but if they decline this opportunity to investigate Waits, then, when the book is exposed as a hoax (as it certainly will be eventually), they will suffer not only embarrassment but serious damage to their reputation for journalistic integrity. (I don't know whether they have a reputation for journalistic integrity, but they probably like to imagine that they do.)

At the same time I will write to the Missoulian, cite a few points that demonstrate Waits's dishonesty, and offer to cooperate with them in an investigation of Waits's claims. I'm also offering similar cooperation to Rick Sallinger.

If the Missoulian declines to investigate Waits, I will write a ~~brief~~ letter-to-the-editor, or, better, a brief article, which I will try to get Published in the Missoulian and other Montana papers, in which I will exhibit a few of the most solid pieces of

This is not a capital P. It is merely a lower-case p that suffers from an overactive pituitary gland.

evidence that Waits is a liar.

What do you think about this? Any suggestions? I'd also like to suggest collaboration in the investigation of Waits by Rick Sullinger, the Missoulian, and (if he's interested) Ulveman. What do you think?

Once I get an article written, you can help me (if you like) by trying to place it for me in some Montana newspapers. You can do this more easily than I can, because I am hampered by slow communications. Also, of course, you know the publishing business and I don't.

By the way, the book apparently is being made available in Western Montana, since a couple of my correspondents at Lincoln speak of people who have purchased copies, and apparently they ^{copies, not people} are being sold at the Town and Country store in Lincoln. So I definitely should make some answer in the Montana newspapers, if I can't get the newspapers themselves to investigate Waits.

I'll write you again soon on this subject.

By the way, if you have any info about the Waits affair (or any other info) that you think should be communicated to me promptly, you may be able to get it to me via Michael Mello, since he can make legal phone calls to me. (Bonnie would be too busy.)

Best regards,

Ted

IED KACZYNSKI
to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

January 29, 1999
Item #34
Certified
Article # Z 403 256 559

Dear Beau,

To answer your letter of January 11:
p. 1, ¶ 3. Bonnie did send me the copy of
the e-mail notice. No need to apologize.

p. 2, ¶ 3. Good — do strike "it's no harsher
than ... in any case." As for the paragraph you
wanted me to add, I think it's good to use it,
but only as a footnote, not in the main text.

p. 2, ¶ 5. Yes, I and Jensen both understand
that you will only look at any manuscripts he
may send you, and that there is no guarantee
that you will accept anything. I don't know
whether I do respect Jensen as a writer.
The only thing of his that I've seen is
Listening to the Land; this seems to me to
be very well written, but from an ideological
point of view I dislike the greater part of
it. Jensen is very emotional, hence, in my
opinion, not good at rational analysis. But, for
that very reason, his fiction (of which I
have seen nothing) may be much better than
his nonfiction. He says he's planning a novel
to be called "Flashpoint." From the little he's
told me about it, it sounds as if it may be
something like a radicalized version of
Edward Abbey's "Monkeywrench Gang." I don't
know whether it will be any good, but
anyway I look forward to seeing it.

p. 3, ¶ 2, 3. I've been thinking about these
matters, and I'll be ready to reconsider my
stand about 60 Minutes if I find good reason
to do so. If and when I get my thoughts on
this subject sufficiently clarified, I'll write
you something about it. Meanwhile, I'll be
glad to hear any ideas you may have about
how I might use 60 Minutes to achieve

2.

suitable goals without prostituting myself to image-making techniques and all that sort of garbage.

p. 3, # 5, p. 4, # 1. Ditto.

p. 4, # 2. Yes. Language. In 1978-79 I worked at a factory job with some people from Pakistan. They told me that they all spoke seventeen languages. (And I don't think they were counting English, which would make it eighteen.) These were all languages spoken in various parts of India and Pakistan.

What fascinates me about Turkish is its grammatical structure. It's an agglutinative language; by adding a string of endings onto a word it forms long, complex words that incorporate a great deal of meaning. And, says the book, the grammar is almost perfectly regular. Thus, there are no lists of irregular words to memorize as in German or Russian. The rules of Turkish are rather complex, but once you have learned them you can form words without worrying about their individual peculiarities. Alas, I'll probably never find time to learn any Turkish.

I think the Iranian language that Ramzi Yousef speaks is not Farsi, but something else. But I'm not certain.

Yes, to be really fluent in a language, I suppose you have to spend considerable time with native speakers.

So you play classical guitar. I wish you could come and play for me. I haven't heard any substantial amount of classical music for many years. Do you play any Vivaldi?

My trouble with oral Spanish is not in speaking it. There was an investigator on my defense team who was half Mexican, and he told me that my Spanish pronunciation was good, except that I had a Spanish accent — i.e., I spoke like a Spaniard rather than like a Mexican or other Hispanic-American. But I speak slowly and haltingly because I have to search my mind

for words.

However, my real problem with oral Spanish is in understanding the spoken language. It's alright if ~~some~~ someone speaks very slowly and clearly; but Hispanics ~~are~~ tend to speak rapidly, and when they go at their normal rate I can understand very little of what they say.

p. 4, ¶ 4 and p. 5, ¶ 1. As for printing letters with Industrial Society and Its Future, it's strictly up to you whether you want to use them or not. I take no position on that question. But, to tell the truth, I was planning to dump on you the task of selecting such letters. I don't have the letters with me. A few are at the Federal Defenders Office in Sacramento, but the rest have been sent to the University of Michigan Library, which wants to have my personal papers. If you wanted to use any of those letters, you would, I suppose, have to go to the U. of M. and search through them yourself for the very small percentage that might be worth printing.

Please keep confidential the fact that the U. of Michigan Library will probably get my papers. They don't want to have it announced publicly just yet.

As for a foreword by me, I really don't know what I would write in such a foreword. But I have written some commentaries on particular points covered in Industrial Society and Its Future, and you might be ~~rather~~ interested in those.

p. 5, ¶ 2. Concerning the "missing" letter, item # 20 on the list I sent you: The letter dated December 5 was the note that I sent you to

7.

send to Through carelessness, I listed it as a separate item, though it was sent in the same envelope as item #19.

(By the way, did you contact . . . about photos? If so, how did she respond?)

So, apparently, you've received everything I've sent you. But there is a real problem with the mail: the Fed Defenders in Sacramento recently reported to me that they've failed to receive five of my letters. That makes altogether 10 missing mailpieces now — and I haven't checked with all my correspondents, either.

p. 5, ¶ 5. As for the two envelopes that arrived unsealed, that's the fault of the ADX mailroom. They are supposed to seal the envelopes, but apparently they sometimes forget.

p. 5, ¶ 3. You write, "Whether we mutually understand that a changed society would be desirable, is another matter entirely." Would you clarify your meaning for me? Just where do you stand on this?

As for Chris Waits, I have to defend myself against him. For one thing, I have several friends at Lincoln who have been defending me and calling Waits a liar, as a result of which they have earned the antagonism of Waits and his cronies. I can't just leave them in the lurch by remaining silent. Furthermore, I think the Waits business is likely to turn to my advantage, because his hoax is an incredibly stupid one. In his book, I find, he's told lies that I should easily be able to prove are lies; so, he presumably, will be discredited, and if the national media report further on Waits's book they will presumably report it as a hoax.

I think there's a good chance I can save myself the trouble of writing an article for the Missoulian. What I've done is send letters

(copies of which are enclosed) to the Helena Independent Record (which published the book) and to the Missoulian, in which I listed a few of Waits's lies that can be checked out without much difficulty, and I offered the Missoulian and the Independent Record my full cooperation if they want to ~~me~~ undertake an investigation to test my assertion that Waits is a liar and his book is a hoax. I don't know about the Independent Record, but the Missoulian is a pretty good little paper (as newspapers go), and since they published a major article about Waits's book, I think there's a good chance that concern for their reputation will lead them to do an investigation.

If they don't, then they will look pretty sick for having passed up the opportunity when I later publish proof that Waits is a liar.

p.6, #2. I think you can get in touch with my family members soon — but only after I've given you some pointers on how to deal with them psychologically. I'll have to save that for another letter.

p.6, #3. I did not contact Regnery — he contacted me. Besides your opinion, I have other reasons to suspect that Regnery is a scoundrel.

I think that finishes all the business that I had to cover in this letter. So, just for fun, let me return to a topic that always fascinates me — language. My grandparents were all born in Poland; my parents were both born in this country, but learned Polish from their parents. Unfortunately, I did not learn Polish from my parents; I don't think I know more than a dozen words of that

language. I don't know whether my maternal grandmother^{ever} learned English; she drank herself to death at an early age, and I never knew her. My paternal grandfather spoke Russian and German as well as Polish, but I'm told that he never learned English. My paternal grandmother and my maternal grandfather both had an excellent command of broken English. Speaking of which, there was an article many years ago in the Scientific American* about pidgin English. It — the variety of pidgin English discussed by the author — had an odd charm to it. If I remember correctly, the article recounted the story of Theseus and the Minotaur in pidgin English, and it went something like this: "Now, him go long disfella islan', nem belong him Crete. ~~The~~ King disfella islan', him badfella king, nem belong him Minos ... " etc. It was somewhat hilarious.

To come back to Polacks who don't speak English, my father once told me the following story:

Back in the 1930's, there was a Polack fresh over from the old country who needed a job, but spoke ~~no~~ no English. So he went to another Polack who had been in the U.S. for a long time and asked him for help.

This second ~~first~~ Polack said, "Oh, they need someone at the laundry where I work. You can get a job there." The first Polack said, "But I don't speak English; I don't know what to say."

"That's okay," said the second Polack, "I'll teach you what to say."

So he spent two hours teaching the

* At least I think it was in the Scientific American. Anyway, it was somewhere.

first Polack to say, in English, "You fucking son of a bitch, kiss my ass and suck my cock."

The next day the first Polack went to the laundry, looked around to see who was giving the orders, went up to him and said in his ~~most humble~~ humblest and most ingratiating tones, "You fucking son of beech, keeps my ess end sock my cock."

Well, the foreman was pretty sharp. He realized that this guy didn't know what he was saying, so he called over someone who spoke Polish and had him translate. Through the translator, he asked the Polack, "Who told you to say that to me?" The Polack answered, "Zbigniew Poznowski* told me to say it."

"Get Zbigniew over here," ordered the foreman.

When Zbigniew arrived, the foreman said, "You're fired. He's got your job." This was a serious matter, too, because the Depression was on, and it was extremely difficult to get a job.

Okay, enough of that. I shouldn't be wasting my time on these frivolities. I've got too much to do.

Best regards,

Tad Kaeyynski

P.S. Bonnie passed on to me your warning that Rick Sallinger is "after

* fictitious name.

something bigger" than the investigation of Waits. I know it well. He wants to do an interview with me. But I've been giving him information only for the Waits investigation.

—TK

P.P.S. Please let me know whether you have received items # 28 through 33.

—TK

P.³S. I just received your letter of January 26. I'll answer it as soon as I can. Meanwhile — would you be able to obtain for me transcripts of any stories about me that Sallinger may broadcast? I asked Sallinger to send me such transcripts, but it's an open question whether he will send them or not. It's possible that he may prefer that I not know some of the things he broadcasts about me.

Glad you liked Jensen's sample.

—TK

P.⁴S. Can I now assume that I won't have to do anything further with corrections of Mello's book? I want to know so that, if I no longer need my notes on Mello's book and my copy of it, I can send them elsewhere ~~for~~ for safe-keeping. I'm not allowed to accumulate too much stuff in my cell.

—TK

TED KACZYNSKI
to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

February 5, 1999

Item #35

Certified # Z 403 256 526

Dear Beau,

In the third postscript to my letter of January 29, I referred to your letter of January 26. I meant January 25.

To reply now to your letter of January 25 — Yes, I will be very cautious with Sallinger. Don't give him any information except what he really needs in order to investigate Chris Waits.

You're right that I should correspond with Ulvenan. The trouble is that I already have more correspondents than I can handle. If you're in touch with Ulvenan, please tell him that I appreciate the investigations he is undertaking, that I would be interested to know what he has found out, and that I suggest he should obtain a copy of the defense's Motion to Suppress Evidence, the prosecution's brief in opposition to that motion, and the defense's reply to the prosecution's brief. These are public documents and can be obtained from the court. Also please explain to Ulvenan that only lack of time prevents me from corresponding with him. Tell him that if he would like to send me a few questions that can be answered briefly, I will try to find time to answer them for him. Also tell him that I'll write to Gina Denver and Judy Clarke and ask them to take a cooperative attitude if Ulvenan should contact them with questions about the Motion to Suppress Evidence (Though I can't guarantee that they will take a cooperative attitude. They both have a very low opinion of journalists.)

|||||||

I haven't seen the five chapters that Derrick Jensen sent you, and I have no idea what they are about. I haven't seen much of Jensen's writing beyond Listening To the Land, so if it turns out that I've put you in touch with a writer with whom you'll be very ~~be~~ pleased, it's just blind luck.

.....

There is no way I can provide you with a good copy of the manuscript of Industrial Society and Its Future that was received by the New York Times. The best I can hope to do is provide you with a copy that is legible — just barely legible. If you want a good copy, then you (or your assistant) will have to transcribe painstakingly the barely-legible copy that I can give you.

Of many documents the FBI gave us very poor photocopies. One of the most common problems is that parts of their copies are too dark and other parts are too light, so that when they are recopied, either some parts of the text come out too dark to be read, or else other parts come out too light to be read.

Apparently the copy that the Fed Defenders Office sent you was made carelessly. This does not surprise me. The Fed Defenders Office is not a model of efficiency.

I had a copy that was (barely) legible. I lent it to someone who wrote back to me that the envelope in which the manuscript arrived appeared to have been tampered with, i.e., opened and resealed, and that several pages of the manuscript were missing.

That is why, when I got the manuscript back, I did not send it to you, but instead asked Dennis to send you another copy. Since that copy turned out to be illegible, I am

sending you my copy (enclosed), which lacks pages 11, 52, 53, 54, 55. I've written to Denvir and asked him to send you legible copies of these pages.

The parts of my copy that are barely legible, or perhaps illegible, are so because they are too light. You mentioned in your letter of ~~1~~ 1/25/99 that parts of the copy you received are too dark to read. So, by combining your copy with the one I'm sending you, you should be able to get the complete text of the document (except pages 11, 52, 53, 54, 55, which, as I've indicated, you should soon receive from Denvir).

With the (incomplete) manuscript of Industrial Society and Its Future I'm enclosing a copy (also provided by the FBI) of the covering letter that was sent with it to the New York Times. You probably won't want to use the whole letter; the parts you're most likely to want to use I've marked with blue ballpoint in the margin.

In addition, I'm enclosing a copy of a letter that was received by Scientific American Magazine. You may want to use it, too.

When you are finished with the enclosed documents, please return them to me. I'm in no very great hurry to get them back, but it would be nice if you could return them to me within a couple of months or so.

.....

I'm also enclosing a copy of a letter that I received from CNN; this you can keep.

.....

I think you once offered to get me any books or the like that I might want. Well, I'd like to have a Gutenberg Bible. I have a regular

bible, you understand; what I want is a Gutenberg Bible. However, just in case your local bookstore doesn't happen to have any Gutenberg Bibles in stock at the moment, here's something you can do for me as an alternative: If Benvenuto Cellini's autobiography is readily available (in English), you might pick up a copy of it and send it to Lydia Eccles, 1

O2112-

I suppose you know who Lydia Eccles is; she's quoted in Mello's book. She's an artist, and she was going to design a greeting card for me based on a drawing of Benvenuto Cellini's famous statue, "Perseus holding the head of Medusa." The idea was derived from a pun — Florence, Italy vs. Florence, Colorado. Anyway, I asked Lydia whether she had ever read Cellini's autobiography, and she said that she had not. Given her interest in art, she ought to find ^{the autobiography} ~~it~~ interesting. Not that you have to be interested in art to find Cellini's autobiography interesting.

.....

You offered to help me with this matter of Waits's book. Here's one way you can help me, if it's feasible for you: Find out what newspapers in Montana (besides the Missoulian and the Helena Independent Record) published articles about Waits's book; and get me the addresses of any such newspapers. If this would cost you too much trouble, you needn't bother.

.....

One more thing, if I'm not overburdening you with requests — Could you get me a copy of the article by Michael Higgins, ~~At A Difficult Client~~ A Difficult Client, ABA Journal, March, 1998, which is cited in Mello's book, page 17 and endnote 77? Thanks.

Best regards,

Ted

Postscript To letter of 2/5/99 (#35).

To a highly intelligent correspondent of mine at Lincoln I quoted part of the material ~~on~~ about Chris Waits on pp. 18-19 of Truth versus Lies. She was confused by the sentence,

"Except for my brother and my mother, the one informant whom I definitely know to be consciously lying is Chris Waits of Lincoln, Montana." (Truth vs. Lies, p. 18, lines 13-14)

My ~~informa~~ correspondent wasn't sure whether this meant that my brother and mother were consciously lying. She didn't have the context, which would have helped her, but even so it seems well to reformulate the sentence to make it clearer. So I'd like to change this sentence to read as follows:

"Apart from my brother and my mother, the only informant whom I definitely know to be consciously lying is Chris Waits of Lincoln, Montana."

Would you agree that this makes the meaning clearer?

- TK

Another postscript to letter of 2/5/99 (#35):

To avoid a too-soon repetition of a form of the verb "express" on page 72, line 2 of Truth versus Lies, I would like to change "the affection I had expressed" to "the affection I had indicated."

Also, I would like to insert the following new paragraph between lines 3 and 4 on page 427 of Truth versus Lies:

For the benefit of people who find it incredible (as I once would have found it) that journalists employed by respectable news organizations would intentionally lie in their articles, I note that according to an Associated Press report, "The New Republic magazine and The Boston Globe acknowledged that writers made up quotes and people used in stories."

A footnote citing the Associated Press report will have to be inserted between footnotes 6 and 7 of Chapter XVI. However, I'm not sure how the report should be cited. I assume that you would know about that sort of thing. I got the report from something that someone took off the Internet and sent to me 1.11.99

is at the head of the piece of paper I received is the following:

Subj: Editors Urged to Challenge Accuracy

Date: 10/15/1998 6:42:58 PM Central Daylight Time

From: AOL News

BCC: [Name of the correspondent who sent me the item]

Editors Urged to Challenge Accuracy

c The Associated Press

By MICHAEL WHITE

ANAHEIM, Calif. (AP)-- [The Text of the article follows. The passage I quoted above appears in the fourth paragraph.]

February 8, 1999

to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

Item # 36

Dear Beau,

Here is a copy of the Associated Press
report that I referred to in my last letter
to you, # 35.

Best regards,

Ted

TED KACZYNSKI
To
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

Item
#37

February 14, 1999

Dear Beau,

In our phone conversation of February 11, you told me that the Helena Independent Record, Montana Magazine, and the Missoulian are all owned by the same company. I'm not sure I had ever known of the existence of Montana Magazine before I heard that it was co-publishing Waits's book, but I'm not surprised to learn that the Missoulian and the Independent Record are owned by the same company. I've known for some time that a number of Montana newspapers are owned by one company. I think it's called Lee Publications or something like that. But I had the impression that the newspapers were run independently and that the parent company pretty much left them alone, at least as far as news and editorial content were concerned. Maybe that's the impression that the parent company and the newspapers like to give, but it looks as if the impression is false.

Anyway, what I'd like to do is this: I've written a brief letter (enclosed) about the Independent Record's and the Missoulian's actions in regard to Waits's book. I'd like to send this to one or more Montana papers, accompanied by copies of my letters to the Missoulian (1/24/99), the Independent Record (1/26/99), and Montana Magazine (2/2/99), and invite them to publish it (and also, if they like, the letters to

the Missoulian, the Independent Record, and Montana Mag). Publication would be on condition that I retain copyright, so that I can later publish the material elsewhere if I like.

The trouble is that I don't know which papers to send the letter to. The only papers I know of in Montana that I'm pretty sure are not owned by the Lee chain are the Great Falls Tribune and the Blackfoot Valley Dispatch. I question whether either would publish the letter, and the B.V. Dispatch is just a tiny little Lincoln paper of small circulation.

Would you be willing to help me here? You have the luxury of prompt communication, which I do not have. Could you see if you can get my letter placed in one or more Montana papers (preferably Western Montana) as soon as possible? Please let me know whether you're willing and able to do this.

If I can get this letter published, and if Ulveman is serious about investigating Waits and exposing him, then I'll hold off and just let Ulveman do the job, though of course I'll give him all the help he may ask me for. Otherwise I'll have to write something myself about Waits's book, which will be a pain in the rear, because I'll have to get people to collect information and evidence that I can't collect myself.

I have written to Ulveman on this subject, by the way.

The Livingston [Montana] Enterprise published an article about Waits's book on 12/14/98; maybe they're owned by the Lee chain too.

At 4:30 PM on February 11, Timothy McVeigh, who has the cell two doors down the hall from mine, called out to me that there was going to be something about me on Channel 6. I don't ~~watch~~ watch TV for entertainment, but I'm willing to turn the damn thing on if there's a practical need for it. So I turned on Channel 6, a station that described itself as a "sister station" of KCNC in Denver (Rick Sallinger's station), and it showed a brief segment (3 minutes?) that it said was the first part of a "four-part series" with Sallinger about Waits's book. This introductory segment seemed neutral about the validity of Waits's claims, mentioning my denial but expressing no opinion about who was telling the truth. The next day at 4:30 PM, I turned on the same channel hoping to get the second part of the "four-part series," but there was no mention of it. So I don't know when, if ever, the rest of the series will air. It's curious that I've had no letters from Sallinger for some time. So ???

~~~~~

There are other things that I ought to be discussing with you, but I'll have to put them off a little longer. Bonnie has given me a big assignment, and I have to give

that priority over other work.

Best regards,

Ted

P.S. On that TV program, Sallinger stated that I was publishing a book that would probably come out about June. That's more than I know! Is it true that T. vs L. can be expected to appear about June?

- T.

P.P.S. In our telephone conversation you mentioned some photographs of my cabin that showed no hole in the walls through which ~~there~~ a pipe could have passed. Could you get me copies of those photographs?

- T.

TED KACZYNSKI

to

BEAU FRIEDLANDER

February 16, 1999

item #38

Dear Beau,

In response ~~to~~ to your letter of February 5, p. #3, yes, I'm quite willing to let you help with the interactions with the press. The problem is that our communications are too slow. I give you a free ~~hand~~ hand to do what you like on the basis of the materials I've already sent you — the only restriction ~~is must be~~ that you musn't say or publish anything on my behalf that's untruthful.

There's a lot of stuff in Wait's book, besides the stuff I've mentioned in the letters I've sent you, that could be shown false with a greater or lesser amount of investigation, but I won't be able to send you a list of ~~these items~~ these items for a while because Bonnie has given me a huge assignment and I have to give that priority. So do the best you can with the information that you have. And the following:

A correspondent of mine at Lincoln has measured the distance along Stemple Pass Road from my turnoff to Wait's place and has found it to be 2.85 miles. So much for Wait's claim that his place is "nearly across the road" from mine.

The same correspondent has confirmed by means of a Forest Service map that what Wait's owns of McClellan Gulch is only a narrow strip, about  $\frac{1}{8}$  mile wide, along the

~~bottom~~ creek — hence only a small fraction of the land in the McClellan drainage. So much for Wait's claim that he "owns the whole gulch and everything in it" and that I ~~was~~ needed his permission to go there.

In handling this Wait's business for me, you'll find the following people helpful: Quin Denvir and Judy Clarke, of course, and also

Michael Donahoe

and

Betsy Anderson

Federal Defenders of Montana

P.O. Box 250

Helena MT 59624-0250

phone

phone unknown to me.

Keep name confidential. ~~I~~ I don't think she wants it advertised.

"" ""

[It's no doubt ungrateful for me to say it, since without his help I never would have found Bonnie, but by this time I'm fully convinced that Mello is an ass. I just got a letter from him in which he says that Wait's may have been mistaken or inaccurate on some minor points, but that doesn't mean

The Livingston [Montana] Enterprise published an article about Waits's book on 12/14/98; maybe they're owned by the Lee chain too.

At 4:30 PM on February 11, Timothy McVeigh, who has the cell two doors down the hall from mine, called out to me that there was going to be something about me on Channel 6. I don't ~~watch~~ watch TV for entertainment, but I'm willing to turn the damn thing on if there's a practical need for it. So I turned on Channel 6, a station that described itself as a "sister station" of KCNC in Denver (Rick Sallinger's station), and it showed a brief segment (3 minutes?) that it said was the first part of a "four-part series" with Sallinger about Waits's book. This introductory segment seemed neutral about the validity of Waits's claims, mentioning my denial but expressing no opinion about who was telling the truth. The next day at 4:30 PM, I turned on the same channel hoping to get the second part of the "four-part series," but there was no mention of it. So I don't know when, if ever, the rest of the series will air. It's curious that I've had no letters from Sallinger for some time. So ???

~~~~~

There are other things that I ought to be discussing with you, but I'll have to put them off a little longer. Bonnie has given me a big assignment, and I have to give

that priority over other work.

Best regards,

Ted

P.S. On that TV program, Sallinger stated that I was publishing a book that would probably come out about June. That's more than I know! Is it true that T. vs L. can be expected to appear about June?

- T.

P.P.S. In our telephone conversation you mentioned some photographs of my cabin that showed no hole in the walls through which ~~there~~ a pipe could have passed. Could you get me copies of those photographs?

- T.

TED KACZYNSKI
to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

February 18, 1999

Item
#39

Dear Beau,

I'm swamped with a long list of difficult questions that Bonnie has sent me, so I can't answer your recent letters properly just yet. But I want to cover a couple of points briefly.

With the work on the \$2255 motion, I don't see how I'm going to be able to find time to do the work on the book. So send me Korzenik's legally-motivated changes first. After I've gone over those, then I'll see what time I can find for considering other edits.

I think I forgot to make a correction in the xerox copy I sent you of that note about Waits's book, the one that begins, "Shortly after I read Unabomber ..." This accompanied my letter of Feb. 14 (#37). The last line of the first page of this note got "cut off" on the xerox copy. The last two lines should read:

any effort to check up on Waits's claims in any other way,

(whom I mentioned to you in my letter #38) has just informed me that the Blackfoot Valley Dispatch (at her instance) will publish my letter to the Independent Record. It turns out that the Lingards, who publish the Blackfoot Valley Dispatch, have a

very low opinion of Waits and do not like him at all.

In my last letter, #38, I said I thought Sallinger was trying to be fair, but now, ~~now~~ having thought it over, I'm not so sure. He recounted the incident in which I slashed the tires and sugged the gas of two ~~motorcyclists~~ ^{motorcycles}, but he only ~~says~~ ^{said} that I "came on some motorcyclists in the woods". He didn't mention that they were cutting trees to make a trail and that what they were doing was probably illegal.

Ok, — I've got to get back to my work for Bonnie.

Best regards,

Ted

[This was written on a photocopy of
a letter dated 2/19/99 from ~~Bradley~~
Bradley Davis of NBC. The third ¶ of
the letter, beginning "Three weeks ...," was
circled, by me, as the "comic relief"
referred to.]

Feb. 26, 1999

Dear Beau,

I'm sending you this for
comic relief.

I'll answer your recent letters
when I can find time, but right now I'm
absorbed in answering Bonnie's questions.

Quin Denvir just sent me some splendid
photographs of my Montana property, local
plants, etc. Do you want to see them for
Truth vs Lies? Or ^{shall I} save them for another book?

P.S. I sent Ulveman a letter dated Feb. 9. I'm mildly
surprised that I've received no reply. Next time you're in
touch with U. you might ask him if he got the letter. - T.

- Ted

TED KACZYNSKI
to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

March 10, 1999

Item #41

Certified # Z 403 256 805

Dear Beau:

In this letter I'm not going to try to answer your recent letters fully or say everything that needs to be said. I just want to cover the matters that are most pressing, because for the last month I've had to devote most of my effort to answering Bonnie's difficult questions, and as a result I'm way behind on everything.

James Brooke of the New York Times sent me a kind of asshole-licking letter dated February 22 in which he tried to get chummy with me in an effort to induce me to give him information, which I haven't done. I also received a letter dated February 22 from (the librarian at Lincoln) in which she writes as follows:

"Rick [Sallinger] is also in contact with a James Brooke from the New York times — based out of Denver. James came into the Library about 2 weeks ago & attacked me at the Library. He said he had just come from Chris Wait's & wanted to know why I wasn't carrying Chris's book in the Library. Boy was he loaded for bear — he was so rude to me. So if a James Brooke contacts you be careful OK?"

As to Waits, I agree with you that we should wait until we have built a solid case against him before making a further effort to combat him publicly. Waiting, moreover, would accord with Bonnie's wishes. He wrote me that he takes a dim view of the publicity connected with the Waits affair, so I wrote him that I would hold off until May 4.

I'm not particularly interested in shutting Waits up, I just want to make sure that

disproof of his crap is available for those who are sufficiently interested to consider the case seriously. In fact, the more Waits talks and writes, the better I'll like it, because I think you're ~~was~~ right in believing that he's a pathological liar. The more he talks and writes about my case, the more lies he will tell, hence the proof of his dishonesty will be the clearer. My only worry is that he might get hooked up with a ghost writer who is more able than Dave Shors and would help him concoct a more believable hoax, ~~is~~ harder to discredit. So it may be good for my Lincoln friend, . . . , to provoke Waits to spout off locally and keep a record of what he says, because the more lies he tells, the better.

I don't think there's any hope that the mainstream media will ever come down on my side in the Waits affair or in anything else. The news items about Truth vs Lies that you sent me help to confirm that the mainstream media will always put a negative slant on anything that I say or do. Sallinger in his TV pieces that I saw actually gave me the least negative treatment of any media people that I know of, except William Finnegan, and, in just one of her articles, Christine Craft. (Yet it seems clear by now that Sallinger has no serious interest in investigating Waits. I conjecture that he's trying to steer between Scylla and Carybdis (sp?) by treating me gently enough so that I won't stop giving him info, yet not treating me so gently that his media colleagues will be offended.)

Bonnie told me that you're planning to insert my letter to the Missoulain in Truth versus Lies. Please do not do so! That letter was not intended to be anything like a complete

debunking of Waits's book. It was only meant to give the Independent Record and the Missoulian (assuming that they had been honest) a sufficient reason to investigate Waits. If they had done so (seriously and honestly), they would have saved us the trouble of collecting evidence against Waits.

Please don't use Scharlette Holdman's declaration publicly until further notice. It may contain an error, and that should be cleared up before it is made public.

, who has been acting on my behalf at Lincoln in connection with the Waits affair, has impressed me very favorably. I've known for some time that she's very smart, but she has now shown herself also to be very enterprising ~~and~~ and effective. Among other things, she got me deeds and sketch maps that prove beyond any doubt how egregiously Waits was lying when he claimed that he owned "the whole gulch and everything in it." Moreover, some of her letters, especially one of her most recent ones, indicate that she understands me and my values better than anyone else, with the possible exception of Lydia Eccles.

Accordingly, I wrote to a few days ago and offered to let her take charge of the Waits affair for me, if she is willing to assume that responsibility. If she does assume it, she would serve more or less as a stand-in for me as far as Waits is concerned. I've advised her to pay close attention to your advice, but she would have the power to write and publish things in connection with the affair, decide how far to trust Ulveman, and make other decisions

that I would otherwise make myself. This arrangement will have certain advantages, among them the fact that it would take a load off my overburdened shoulders and the fact that, whereas my communications are very slow, has access to the normal facilities for communication. As you have certainly guessed by now, I have a high opinion of this lady.

By the way, you're right about Scharlette Holdman — she is Investigator #2. That's why I want to get a statement from (Investigator #1). As far as I know, there is no reason to question honesty.

||||||

I'm not very happy about the fact that my family has been tipped off to what Truth versus Lies is about, because now there will be much less chance of getting their permission to print ~~my~~ ^{their} letters, of getting photographs from them, or of getting certain information from them. I should have written to you earlier about my family, but I've been so damned busy trying to get Bonnie's questions answered.

I think there's now no hope at all of getting my brother's permission to print his letters, and there's little chance of getting any photos from him. You can try him, if you like, but before you approach my brother you should approach my mother. If you approach my brother first, he will probably speak to my mother about it and warn her against you, and then you'll have ~~no~~ no chance with her. For the same reason, you should give my mother no advance warning before you visit her, because if you do she will probably contact Dave or Linda about it and they will warn her against you.

So, you should make an unannounced visit

to my mother. It will be very helpful in overcoming her suspiciousness if you bring a sympathetic-looking woman with you. You and the woman should be very respectably dressed — suit and tie of good quality, — but you should avoid wearing any article of clothing that is the least bit flashy. Anything flashy will make my mother suspicious. For the same reason, you and the woman should wear little if any jewellery, and any that you do wear should be very conservative and subdued.

My mother is extremely sensitive to any criticism of her qualities as a parent, so you must assure her that no one is going to try to cast any blame on her for the ~~the~~ offenses that I'm accused of having committed. My mother also is very, very greedy for the kind of status that comes with intellectual achievement, so it will be very helpful in winning her cooperation if you will talk to her at length about my intellectual achievements and tell her how important it is that future historians should know the whole truth, etc., etc. Then, when you've got her softened up, ask her to write a note giving you permission to print her letters, and you can ask her for photographs. I'm not at all optimistic that you will get either, now that she knows what Truth vs Lies is about, but it's worth a try, anyway.

While you're at it, I would appreciate it if you would ask her a series of questions for me. And I am optimistic that you will be able to get her to answer the questions. Here is the purpose of the questions:

You'll recall from Truth vs Lies that my mother and brother claimed that throughout my life I had "shutdowns", or spells when I was unresponsive to the

7. Did the shutdowns ever occur when anyone outside of the immediate family was present? When, where, and who was present?

8. Did any of Ted's teachers ever say anything about shutdowns that occurred when Ted was in school? Who, when, and where? Details

9. Did Wanda ever mention the shutdowns to our pediatrician, Dr. Wright? If so, why is there no mention of them in the medical records? If she did not mention them to Dr. Wright, why not?

Of course, if you take out a list and read the questions from it, my mother will get suspicious. The questions should be asked as casually as possible. Similarly, if you take notes of my mother's answers she will probably get suspicious, so, instead, you should write down my mother's answers as soon as you're out of her presence. However, use your own judgment. If you feel you've established sufficiently good rapport with my mother so that you can ~~not~~ make notes of her answers as she gives them, then do so. Best if you have a witness with you (such as the sympathetic-looking woman I suggested), so that my mother won't be able to disavow her answers later. Better still if my mother's answers could be tape-recorded, but that, again, would probably make her suspicious.

After you've asked my mother these questions, you can ask the same questions of my brother. Best if you can do so before my mother has had a chance to talk to him or Linda about your visit.

This is a delicate errand, but I trust your

judgment and think you can carry ~~it~~ it off successfully if anyone can.

Anyhow, I wish you luck in getting photographs from my brother and mother, and their permission to print the letters. You might have a fair chance with my ~~le~~ mother, but not my brother.

IF, as I think, you can't get my brother's permission to print his letters, then I remind you that I'm anxious to see what Korzenik wants to delete.

Enough for tonight. I'll write you again soon.

Best regards,

Ted

My mother's address:

Wanda Theresa Karczynski

My brother's address:

P.S. I'd like to mention that in my opinion it was ~~some~~ somewhat rash of you to announce a publication date for Truth vs Lies before I've seen the deletions that Korzenik wants to make. You'll recall that I would have preferred to see those before signing the contract. This may be a sticking point and there's no telling how long it may take us to work out our differences. I'm not going to OK the changes just to enable you to meet your deadline, if I'm not satisfied with the text to be published. —TK

to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

Item #42

Certified # Z 403 256 866

March 20, 1977

Dear Beau,

I apologize for having left your letters unanswered for so long, but for a month I was occupied in preparing answers ~~to~~ to a list of difficult questions that Bonnie sent me. That job was nearly finished a week ago when I came down with some type of respiratory and gastric infection that made me so sick that for four days I couldn't do a lick of work. I didn't really feel myself again until today, when I got back to exercising.

Before going back over your letters and answering what needs to be answered, I wanted to get off to you a list of changes for Truth versus Lies. The list is enclosed. Here are some comments:

Change A. The reason for this change is that Julie Herrada of the Labadie Collection does not want the donation of my papers to the Collection to become public knowledge prematurely. Moreover, the ~~University's~~ University's lawyers have been dawdling so long (several months now), without explanation, about approving the contract that I'm beginning to wonder whether I will be giving my papers to the Labadie Collection after all.

Change C and Change E. A woman correspondent of mine expressed hurt feelings over some of the words I quoted from my early writings in reference to women.

To her, apparently, these words felt like a slap in the face, and she opined that many other women would react the same way. For that reason I've decided to make changes C and E. I've thought it over, and I don't think it's necessary to retain that material for the sake of balance, truthfulness, or any such consideration.

Change D. As documentation for this I'm enclosing photocopies of two letters from the young lady in question, one which contains the passage quoted, and another that gives permission to quote the passage in Truth vs Lies.

You'll notice that the woman has signed the letters only with her first name. I imagine this is sufficient for the permission to quote. I'll give you her full name and address if you want them, but in that case the information must be kept strictly confidential, to protect her privacy.

Change F. I decided to delete this stuff because I think it's more likely to confuse the reader than clarify matters for him.

Change G. I thank you very much for enclosing with your March 3 letter the newspaper item titled "Unabomber sister-in-law bares ordeal of family," by Andy Soltis. This item is extremely useful and important, because it provides solid evidence for what I've long believed without having

proof: That it was Linda Patrik who persuaded my brother and mother to take the point of view that I was mentally ill; moreover, that Linda was hostile toward me ("she never wanted Ted inside her home").

Unfortunately, the photocopy you sent me does not give the name of the newspaper in which the item appeared. I hope you can get this information? It's important! This is a choice item.

*

In making the changes A, B, C, etc., I came across a number of things (see the changes K) in the manuscript that seemed to require ~~some~~ minor changes. When one has gone over one's manuscript several times, one becomes numb to it, so to speak, so that one doesn't notice its flaws. But if one puts it aside for a few months and then looks at it again, one sees it with fresh eyes and notices things that ought to be polished up.

So it may be that Truth versus Lies is more in need of line-editing than I thought. Since Bonnie isn't keeping me busy at the moment, this would be a good time for you to send me your edits so that I can check them out.

But what I'm most anxious to see is Korzenik's deletions. In fact, I'm getting very worried about the fact that I've heard nothing from you on that subject. After I get the deletions I may have to do a great deal of work on the text (e.g., paraphrasing deleted parts of letters)

and there's no telling what might come up to prevent me from working on it (demands from Bonnie, for example), so it's very important for me to get those deletions at the earliest possible date, if you don't want to risk missing deadlines. I hope to hear from you immediately on this subject.

*

Have you talked with my brother and mother yet? If so, what were the results of your talk?

Okay — next letter I'll go over your recent letters and answer what needs answering.

Best regards,

Ted

P.S. Please inform me as soon as you possibly can of any deadlines, as for making changes.

— T.

A

On page 3, the last 3 lines should be changed to read as follows:

journalists rummaging through my papers to get material for sensational articles. I hope to get the documents housed in a university library, and arrangements will be made so that some responsible and

B

On page 18, change the fifth line from the bottom of the page to read:

occasions, not more. I once had a brief conversation with him at a garage sale. Apart from that I had no association or contact with him.

↑ no period

C

On page 25, delete lines 3-7 counting from the bottom of the page, and replace them with the following:

it's more likely that Jeanne is remembering a joking comment about women that I made in a letter to her husband, K. H., during the mid-1980's.

Change Note 21 of Chapter III ^{page 98} to read
as follows:

21. (Ac) Autobiog of TJK 1979, pp. 40-42 47; (Ca) FL #329, letter from me to David Kaczynski, March 15, 1986, p. 2; (Ad) Autobiog of TJK 1988, p. 3; (Ca) FL #458, letter from me to my mother, July 5, 1991, pp. 5-8, 12; (Da) Ralph Meister's Declaration, p. 3, paragraph 9 states "At ... times, Wanda lost control and verbally abused him." Further documentation will be given in Chapter IV.

Some people seem to think that only physical and sexual abuse constitute real abuse, and that verbal, psychological, and emotional abuse are relatively insignificant. I've been corresponding with a young woman who for years was subjected to sexual abuse by her stepfather, so that no one will deny that she knows what real abuse is. Later, in adult life, she was subjected to verbal and psychological abuse by her husband, and here is what she wrote to me about it in a letter dated November 23, 1998:

"You asked me on the phone Sunday, if I had ever broken down -- Did you mean if I had ever succumbed psychologically, i.e., had a 'breakdown' on account of the verbal/psychological abuse? I know that I have broken into sweats, felt horribly nervous

and have felt my pulse racing, etc. However, the most prominent/unnerving of all feelings, is the intense, as well as uncontrollable anger I have felt toward him. I have also cried -- if not hysterically, then as if I might never stop. The abuse has done something to me Theodore; it has made me prone to horrible anger"

(This letter is not covered in the Notes on Documents, since it had not even been written when those notes were prepared.)

~~Also see James~~

E

On page 278, last three lines, delete the following words:

As I wrote in my journal, "She has a beautiful face but a very mediocre figure (too much fat on her ass and thighs)."

The superscript numeral ⁹ should be moved so that it appears after the words

her figure was not.⁹

F

On page 331, lines 5-9, delete all of the material beginning with "Of course, my brother ... " and ending with "... needs of the moment.)"

Add the material below following the next-to-last line on page 332, ending in "death penalty:"

Added March 20, 1999: Prior to 1989, neither my brother nor my mother ever thought I was mentally ill. A recent news item provides confirmation of what I've suspected for some time: that after Dave shacked up with Linda Patrik in 1989, she persuaded him to believe that I was mentally ill. According to this news item,

"The sister-in-law of Ted Kaczynski ~~is~~ says she knew for years he was severely mentally ill In the joint interview, David Kaczynski, an upstate social worker, said, 'Our whole family was in denial about the extent of Ted's illness.' Only his wife, who said she never wanted Ted inside her home, pressed the issue." ("Unabomber sister-in-law bares ordeal of family," by Andy Soltis, add here the name of the newspaper and the date on which the article appeared.)

How was Linda able eventually to persuade my brother and mother that I was mentally ill? My brother would have been the more receptive to any negative idea about me because of his covert resentment of me. Much more important, he is in a state of abject

psychological servitude to Linda. On this subject see Chapter XIV. My mother is dependent on Linda indirectly, through her dependence on my brother who is the only living person to whom she is still close. Moreover, as I explained at the end of Chapter VII, she has her own motives for accepting Linda's theory that I am mentally ill.

H

Change line 4 of Note 13 of Chapter XV
(page 440) to read:

\$7,700. See Chapter VII, pp. 212, 213. As to
the \$7,700, my

~~In line 4 of Note 13 of Chapter XVI~~
~~(page 440), change~~

~~seven thousand dollars~~

~~to.~~

~~\$7,700~~

Add the following to Footnote 6 of Appendix 2, page 482.

I don't want to give the impression that I've showered as frequently as this throughout my life. After leaving Harvard I tended to shower as infrequently as I thought I could get away with, which meant about once a week. This was motivated partly by my problem with sensitive skin (a dermatologist once told me that I should shower not more than twice a week), but mostly by rebellion against modern middle-class values. For the latter reason, throughout my life I have steadfastly refused to use deodorants.

When living alone in the woods, I've sometimes passed an entire winter without a bath. Years ago, in some newspaper or magazine, I found a list, published for readers' amusement, of obsolete laws that were still on the books in various states. I clipped out one of the items and pasted it on the wall of my cabin, above the table. It read: "Taking a bath in winter breaks an Indiana law." In those days, I suppose, they were more concerned about pneumonia than about smelly armpits.

- page i, line 3: Replace the word "though" by the word "while"
- page ii, line 8: Replace the word "But" with the word "However," followed by a comma.
- page 22, line 1: Delete the comma after the word "insecure."
- page 42, line 5 counting from the bottom of the page: Delete the comma after the word "movie."
- page 42, line 3 counting from the bottom of the page: Replace the phrase "my father" with the word "him."
- page 178, line 2 counting from the bottom of the page: Replace the word "forget" with the word "forgot."

[with letter ~~###~~ #43]

~~###~~

Following are my various attempts to write the title and by-line for you. If none of these fit the bill, please give me a clearer idea of what you have in mind.

— TJK

TED KACZYNSKI
to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

#49

May 13, 1999

Dear Beau,

I want to apologize for taking so long to answer your letter of April 27. As usual, I can't keep up with things. If it isn't one thing it's another. I had meant to start on my answer to your April 27 letter a couple of hours ago, but at about that time I received a letter from Michael Mello in which he advises me to file another legal motion; and he says it should be filed as soon as possible. I can well understand why. So I'll have to put off answering your April 27 letter for a few days while I get this motion prepared. Again, I'm sorry for this.

But I guess I do have time to tell you about an adventure I had with a baked potato.

It happens that I like baked potatoes better when they're cold than when they're hot, so when we are given a baked potato with a meal I put it aside and save it for a bedtime ~~snack~~ snack. I did this with a baked potato just a few days ago. When the time for my bedtime snack arrived I broke open the skin of the potato and found, to my disgust, that it was rotten. Instead of being firm and white inside it was all mushy and yellow and green. The green was in a layer under the skin of the potato. I suppose you know how potatoes get greened when exposed to light. Greened potatoes are acrid-

tasting and ~~someh~~ somewhat poisonous. So it appeared that I had got stuck with a potato that had first been greened and then got rotten.

But then it struck me that it was somewhat odd that the green layer was uniform all around the potato. Usually a potato gets greened only on one side, where it's been exposed to the light. Curious, I gave the potato a tentative squeeze, which pushed a kind of brown core out of the middle of it. Ugh! What was this? Another kind of rot? I examined the brown thing more closely and discovered that it was ellipsoidal in shape, smooth, and hard. A seed! And then it dawned on me that what I had was not a potato, but an avocado.

I ~~ate~~ ate it with relish, since I am fond of avocados. But previously I had ~~eat~~ eaten avocados only raw — I had never seen a baked one. The baking had turned the skin from a green to a brown-black color, so that I mistook the fruit for a baked potato.

*

Here is a quotation from the Los Angeles Times, April 28, 1999, page A1.

Perhaps you have a sufficient streak of cynicism in your character so that you will find it amusing:

"Outrage and fear came to a head for Maria Martinez the day her 6-year-old daughter picked up what she thought was a balloon and began blowing it up. It was a used condom."

On this cheerful note I will close.

Best regards,

Tea

to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

#54

June 10, 1999

0398.2

Dear Beau,

Your letter of May 21, p. 1, ¶ 2. In Truth vs. Lies I want to avoid committing myself to any opinion as to whether ~~the~~ my cousin Nora has ever suffered from some degree of schizophrenia. I just want to present my brother's statement to the reader along with my aunt's contrary statement, without expressing any opinion of my own as to which of them is right.

The reason is that my brother's and mother's statements are not my only grounds for suspecting that Nora has, or has had, something wrong with her mentally other than depression. Back in the 1970's, not long before her accident, she wrote me a letter (the first one she'd ever sent me) that impressed me as something written by someone who had a few screws loose. At that time I wrote to my parents expressing doubts about Nora's sanity. Both of these letters have been preserved.

Besides that letter, certain facts about Nora's behavior, related to me by my mother in letters that have not been preserved, seemed to me to suggest that Nora had something wrong with her beyond just emotional problems or depression. Of course, information from my mother is not reliable, and as for the letter it's possible that Nora might have been drunk when she wrote it (my mother claimed that Nora suffered from severe alcoholism during that

period), so, as I said, I don't want to take a position one way or the other as to Nora's sanity.

For whatever it's worth, everyone in my immediate family felt that Nora's father, Bill Tuominen, was a bit peculiar; and, according to my father, Bill had two brothers both of whom committed suicide for no apparent reason while still relatively young.

Your letter of May 21, p. 2, #2. Judy Clarke has the hand-printed ms. of Truth vs. Lies. I'll write to her and ask her to send you a copy of a page of it. However, I suggest you should telephone Clarke, 509-624-7606, and discuss with her which page you want to have sent. You wouldn't want to get a page that has something that your lawyers want edited out, or on which I have made some important correction.

Your letter of May 21, p. 2, P.S. Already, ~~and~~ answered in one of my earlier letters. P.P.S. - no, I have not received the Spanish-English Dictionary. I'm beginning to suspect it's been lost in the mail.

Your letter of May 24, #2. Concerning Miller's desire to see the letters I've quoted, please consult my letter of March 27, #45, p. 8.

Your letter of May 24, #2 and #3. I repeat my suggestion that you should call off your dog with your printer until we have a text for the book that we can both agree on. I think we're going to have to take

to

82

BEAU FRIEDLANDER

Dear Beau,

Regarding today's telephone conversation:

I am upset with you. Our contract prohibits you from publishing Truth versus Lies until I have approved all changes made in the text. But you are trying to rush the book into print before we have time to produce a mutually acceptable version of it. The reason you give is that you have made commitments that subject you to certain deadlines. You have repeatedly made such commitments without my consent, without notifying me until after the commitments were made, and without asking my opinion as to whether we could prepare a mutually satisfactory version of the text in time to meet the deadlines. Moreover, you have made these commitments in spite of my repeated urging that you should refrain from doing so; for I wrote you:

Letter # 53, 5/31/99, p.1, ¶2. "... it may take months before we can agree on a satisfactory text. ..., I think we should wait until we've arrived at a mutually satisfactory version of the text, and only after that should you make any arrangements that subject us to time constraints."

Letter # 54, 6/10/99, p.2, ¶6 + p.3, ¶1. "I repeat my suggestion that you should call off

your date with your printer until we have a text for the book that we can both agree on. I think we're going to have to take considerable time and trouble to get all the legal problems worked out."

Letter #58, 6/22/99, p.2, ¶1. "I think you should cancel your date with your printer and not make a new one until we have a satisfactory text prepared."

You had a prior commitment to me, as stated in the contract, not to publish the book until I had approved all changes. You had no business making any other commitments that would interfere with your ability to honor your contractual obligation to me.

Letter #61, 7/8/99, p.2, ¶4. "I won't approve any changes in the text until I've seen a complete copy of what you are going to send to the printer, and have had the opportunity to give it a careful reading."

That still stands. As of now you do not have my approval of the changes in the text, and if you send the book to the printer without that approval you will do so in violation of our contract.

You can't give me the principal blame for the long delays in the preparation of the book. It's true that some delays resulted

from the fact that I had to take time out to meet certain legal deadlines; but much greater delays resulted from the fact that your lawyers apparently didn't begin the legal read-through until mid-March, 1999, and from the fact that they just took their good old time about arranging the conference call. I first suggested the conference call in my letter #61, July 8, 1999, page 4 (with reminders on July 12 and July 20**). Yet the call did not take place until two months later, on September 7.

Now you want to ram things through in a few days before I've had a chance to properly incorporate in the text what I learned from the conference call. If the call had been made a month or six weeks earlier, then maybe we would have had the book ready for the printer by this time.

I suggest that months ago you should have told your distributors and everyone else involved that publication of Truth versus Lies had been postponed indefinitely. Then we could have taken our time and prepared a good version

* The earliest letter of yours in which I find any indication that the read-through was underway was dated 3/20/99.

** Letter #63, 7/12/99, "NOTES ON THE QUESTION OF MILLER'S AND KORZENIK'S ACCESS TO DOCUMENTS"; Letter #65, 7/20/99, p. 2, ¶ 2.

of the text that would have minimized both your ^{legal} risk and mine, and would have enabled us to renumber the footnotes, rewrite the book so as to incorporate the rump of Chapter X into other chapters, and see that everything was shipshape both legally and in other respects before the book was printed.

In any case, I won't approve the changes until I've seen the final version of what you're sending to the printer. If this causes problems for you, then all I can say is that you should never have committed yourself to any deadlines before asking my opinion as to whether we could get a mutually acceptable text prepared in time to meet those deadlines. I would have told you that we shouldn't commit ourselves to any deadlines until after we had a mutually acceptable version of the text.

I don't like being at odds with you. I think you know that I like you personally and value your services as a publisher.

Regretfully, but still with warm regards,

Ted

LEO KALCZYNSKI
To
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

#83

September 18, 1999

Dear Beau,

To begin with, I'll take up where I left off in my letter #80 and continue going over your comments on the correction notes, starting on p.4 of your comments.

p.4, ¶8. I don't see any point in adding this note, though it might have been helpful to add information that was holed up on the mountain and thought the CIA was keeping an eye on him.

p.6, ¶3. See below, my comment on Chapter II, Note 33.

p.7, line 4b. "stubborn stupidity" > "irrational stubbornness". If you're going to make this change on p.118, ¶2, line 1 of the page proofs, then you had best make the same change also on p.119, ¶2, line 10. (My error — I should have noticed that the phrase occurred in two places.)

p.12, ¶8. I was not worried about the legal implications of calling my brother a jackass. I was questioning the wisdom of using unnecessary pejoratives that contribute nothing to my argument.

p.13, ¶1. You ask how long the letter was. I don't have a copy of it here, but I know it was pretty short and the part I quoted was a significant fraction of it.

p.13, ¶2. Your change is okay, but make it "winter" rather than "spring", since the call probably came in January or February of 1998.

p. 13, #4. This was not an "addition". It was in the manuscript that I sent you, but somehow it got left out of the page proofs.

Thanks for the information about the accepted practices in regard to the use of dots to indicate ~~the~~ ellipses.

In our September 14 phone conversation you mentioned that you had arranged insurance to cover your losses in the event we are sued in connection with Truth versus Lies. Since then it has occurred to me that this may lead to a problem. During our conference call on September 7 you indicated that, if you were sued, you could refrain from asking for certain legally-sensitive documents of mine for use in your defense. However, if you are insured, I imagine that your contract with the insurance company gives the company the right to litigate the lawsuit. The company of course will be indifferent to any legal harm that they may do me, so they will probably subpoena whatever documents of mine they think may be useful for the defense.

This dictates extra caution on my part with regard to the documents that I cite in the book. So I'd like to delete some further citations that can be taken out without perceptibly weakening my argument:

Chapter II, Note 17. Change this to read:

17. (Ac) Autobiog of TJK 1979, p. 12.

Chapter II, Note 18. Delete the number "194" from the first line of this note.

Chapter II, Note 19. Delete from this note the words: "(Ac) Autobiog of TJK 1979, p. 194;"

Chapter VII. Delete notes 4, 5, 8. If you like, you can replace these with:

4. This note has been deleted to avoid risk of legal complications.

and similarly for Notes 5 and 8.

Chapter VII, Note 13. Delete the words: "(Ac) Autobiog of TJK 1979, p. 198;"

Other corrections that I've noticed are needed:

Introduction, Note 5. At the very end of this note, the citation should be (Qc) Written Reports by Investigator #2, p. 2.

p. 127 (page proofs), next-to-last ¶, line 2. The date 1982 should be 1983.

L p. 292 (page proofs) Shouldn't the second paragraph on this page be deleted in order to avoid risk of a libel suit from Joel Schwartz's mother?

p. 299 (page proofs), fourth ¶ from bottom of page, next-to-last line of the ¶. "The Bible as History" should be in single quotation marks ('... ') rather than double quotation marks ("... ") .

Chapter II, Note 23. Part of this note is omitted in the page proofs. (I made this correction in my earlier list of corrections to the page proofs, but I cited Chapter I, Note 23 by mistake, instead of Chapter II.)

Chapter II, Note 33. Change "a few pages back" to "earlier." (Again, I made this correction earlier but cited Chapter I instead of Chapter II by mistake.)

In our September 14 phone conversation, you said you were taking out of the text the explanation about Dave's refusal to allow publication of his letters. You said you would see that this was covered in the media hype.

But it's not clear to me why the media coverage should be inconsistent with the insertion of a note in the book. There may be many readers who will fail to see or fail to absorb the media information.

My concern is this: Many readers, seeing that the letters in Chapter XV were deleted because Dave refused permission, may assume that he did give permission for publication of the other letters that are printed in the book.

So I would like to add the following note to the Foreword, immediately preceding the last ¶ on p. 14 (page proofs):

"

My brother has refused to give my publisher and me permission to reproduce any parts of his letters in this book. Aspects of copyright law that I need not discuss here nevertheless allowed us to print many extracts from his letters. However, other extracts that we would have liked to include have had to be deleted.

"

It's possible that you may have reasons that I don't know of for not including any note of this kind, so if you don't want to add this note then you need not do so.

=====

I must admit, that I'm uneasy about the possibility of a suit (for copyright infringement) by Dave. I can't help wondering whether your lawyers have been lax, because it seems to me that there is a significant amount of quoted material that is not really necessary for the defense of my reputation. It had been my impression that your lawyers were going to go over all the quoted material and pare it down to what was essential for my thesis, but they don't seem to have done so. I would be willing to attempt to do this myself if you wanted me to, but I imagine you're in too much of a hurry to get the book into print.

(to next page)

If it is desired to incorporate the rump of Chapter X in Chapter IX, this can be done as follows:

Following ¶ 6 of p. 155 (page proofs), which reads "My brother never ... in any subsequent letter of his," insert the following:

"

My brother's conflicting feelings toward me were shown also by his actions in connection with the affair.

"

Now continue with the second paragraph of the rewritten version of Chapter X that starts on page 10 of the material that I sent you with my letter #81, "My behavior toward ... was a good deal less than chivalrous ..."

Continue with this material through the second paragraph on page 15. Then go to the third paragraph on page 169 of the page proofs: "I think if the manner of your taking revenge ..." and continue through the words "... a judge or a jury." on page 170 of the page proofs. Next, go back to page 155 of the page proofs and begin with the words, "The contrast between my brother's deep-lying resentment ...," and continue to the end of Chapter IX. Of course, the footnotes will have to be re-numbered.

Knowing that you're in a hurry to get the book into print, I'd just like to remind you that for quick communication your lawyers can always make me a legal phone call to discuss the legal problems.

You may recall that at the interview with Dubner we exchanged some remarks about bad puns. Try this out for bad puns:

Question. Two trains are on the same track. The engineer of one train is a Norwegian, and the engineer of the other is an alcoholic. The trains are rushing toward each other at a speed of 60 miles per hour. Nevertheless, there will be no train wreck. Can you explain why?

Hint: Think of Rudyard Kipling.

Give up? Okay, the reason why there will be no train wreck is that Norse is Norse and souse is souse and never the twains shall meet.

Warm regards,

Ted

P.S. I still have not received the letter from your lawyers.

— T.

IED KALCZYNSKI
to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

September 21, 1999

#84

Dear Beau,

In answer to Vicki Gordon's letter of September 16 and your note that accompanied it, I'm just not interested in Sexy Minutes. (There's another bad pun.) Let's assume that they are completely honest and will do exactly what they say. Even so, according to an earlier letter of yours, they want to do an "explosive news story" about Dave's being a sell-out radical. To me that sounds like cheap propaganda. In fact, it could hardly be anything else. Though I must admit that I'm tempted by the idea of retaliating against my brother in that way, I'm not going to do it. By knowingly lending myself to cheap propaganda I would lower myself, and perhaps ^{lose} some respect from the kind of people by whom I most want to be respected.

*

Now for your undated letter that begins, "This is the letter that I agreed to send you when we had our conference call on September 7." I'm not a lawyer, but this letter does not appear to me to be satisfactory. It had been my understanding that I was to receive a letter from Jeffrey Miller expressing his legal opinion. I question whether your statement that Miller gave you such-and-such an opinion would be of any legal utility to me. Moreover, ^{as to} Miller's statement that the release of the four documents

"would not result in the wholesale waiver of privilege with respect to the other currently privileged documents" — The word "wholesale" is much too vague. The statement does not exclude the possibility that there might be waiver of privilege with respect to some other privileged documents, and they might be documents with respect to which I would not want to waive privilege.

Moreover, this opinion of Miller's completely ignores the other problem that we discussed: If I should win my Motion to Suppress Evidence, certain non-privileged documents would cease to be admissible as evidence in my case. But if, meanwhile, some of those documents had been used in a civil action and thereby became part of the record of the case, then those documents would be admissible as evidence in my criminal case regardless of the Motion to Suppress Evidence. The question was whether, in the event there were a suit for ~~copyright infringement~~ libel, and you subpoenaed non-privileged documents that had been cited in Truth versus Lies to defend yourself, this could enable the plaintiffs to subpoena other non-privileged documents that would be legally disadvantageous to me in my criminal case.

It was my understanding from our September 7

conference call that it was Miller's opinion that this would not be a problem; i.e., that there was very little likelihood that the plaintiffs in a libel action (still less in a copyright action) would be able to subpoena non-privileged documents other than those that were cited in Truth versus Lies. But your letter of assurances contains no mention of Miller's opinion on this point.

Your agreement "to provide legal defense for me in the event we should be sued for defamation or libel" is of no interest to me. I don't care in the least if someone does sue me for libel, because all they could get would be a monetary award, and I have no money to lose anyway. It had been my understanding from our September 7 conference call that I was to be assured of legal defense against efforts to subpoena, in connection with a civil suit, privileged or non-privileged documents that would be disadvantageous to me in my criminal case. Legal defense against a libel suit would not assure me of defense against efforts to subpoena such documents, because the documents might not be disadvantageous to me in the libel action even if they were disadvantageous to me in the criminal action.

Until these issues are resolved, I do not agree to the conditions stated in your recent

undated letter of assurances.

I am sending Quin Denvir a copy of your letter, to get his opinion. I suspect he will agree with me that your letter of assurances is not adequate. You might want to telephone him to get a better idea of what he would consider an adequate letter of assurances.

It appears that our legal issues are not yet resolved.

Warm regards,

Ted

IED KACZYNSKI

To

BEAU FRIEDLANDER

September 21, 1997

#85

Dear Beau,

You've written me a couple of times in the past that you didn't care whether you made a profit on Truth vs Lies, but I never took that claim very seriously, and it's your prerogative to increase your profit through publicizing the book by the methods that publishers normally use for that purpose. That would include telling people what the book is about and why they should read it.

You also have your First-Amendment right to express your own opinions on any subject you like, including technology and the antitech movement. But I would appreciate it if, in expressing such opinions publicly, you would make it clear that the opinions are your own and that you are acting as a spokesman neither for me nor for the antitech movement.

I would also appreciate it if you would keep me informed, in as much detail as possible, of any publicity efforts you may undertake that are in any way connected with me, at least when such efforts go beyond merely telling people what Truth vs Lies is about and why they should read it.

Warm regards,

Ted

TED KACZYNSKI
To
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

September 28, 1977

#86

Dear Beau,

In reply to your letter of September 19 — to judge from what you say about him, it appears that Dubner is to be congratulated for his honesty. Apparently you judged him well. If his article does appear in the NY Times mag, then I'm glad that my picture will not appear on the cover. I don't want cheap publicity, just an article that is sober, factual, and accurate. (I wish I could send Tina Brownnose a pair of thick, warm woolen socks, with a note telling her that she needed them because she got cold feet.)

On the subject of publicity —

wrote me a letter about your plans for publicity that prompted me to write you letter #85 yesterday. I assume that what she told me was considerably exaggerated (she herself indicated that she was worked up emotionally when she wrote the letter), but I also assume that there was some truth in it (namely, that you had plans for big-time publicity beyond just the selling of Truth versus Lies) since, for example, you've been trying to nudge me toward an interview with 60 Minutes for a long time. So I wanted to make it clear that, while I can't ask you not to exercise your First-Amendment rights with regard to me and the antitech movement, I think I do have a right to ask you to make it clear that you are not acting as a spokesman for me or for the movement, and that

I don't necessarily endorse any opinions you may express or any publicity you may undertake.

During my interviews with _____, I told her that the interviews were strictly for the Earth First! Journal and that I did not want them to be exploited commercially. She agreed to this. But I learned today that she has tried to peddle her article to the Boston Globe, and possibly to Harper's, without my permission. And she talks about you getting out of hand with publicity. The kettle calling the pot black.

*

I know you're anxious to resolve as quickly as possible the problems involved with Truth vs Lies, so I'll call your attention to the fact that if there are any legal matters that I have to be informed of, or that have to be discussed, Quin Denvir could, and probably would be willing to, make me a legal phone call for the purpose of discussing those matters. In particular, if Denvir were to call me and tell me that he had received letters of assurance from you and your lawyers that he felt would be satisfactory for me, then I would send you forthwith the four documents that your lawyers want.

Warm regards,

Ted

Milled letter. I can't tell
how much of the letter
I'm quoting.

Correct Sánchez
use photos?

(1)

Libel statements:

See letter #45, TJK to RB, March 27, 1999, p.1

Copyright:

B.F. to TJK

9/4/98. "As for publishing the book 'as is', that was something I took to be a given."

9/21/98 "Publishing the manuscript in its entirety has never been an issue with me (which I say at the risk of sounding reckless, since I have yet to see it).

10/20/98, p.2: "Another issue to be addressed is copyright infringement. There may be instances in the text where long excerpts from letters and short stories could be construed as copyright infringement. My lawyer is going to determine how many (if any) cases exist, and of those which can be circumvented by the wiggle-room that exists in current copyright legislation, or through acquiring the rights to reproduce the material. We can get pretty far with a law known as 'fair use'. Fair use indicates a certain percentage of a given document that can be reprinted without permission from the author."

"... I would rather publish all of the material, and I will endeavor to do so."

10/22/98 "My lawyer is currently trying to figure out a way around the applicable copyright laws I will not allow anything to happen to the contents of Truth versus Lies without your express consent."

B.F. to TJK

11/23/98, p.3. "As for our copyright issue, I hope I can set your mind at ease. It does not look like it will be a major issue. ... Copyright law most certainly does allow the use of personal letters to defend one's reputation. The only thing at issue is relevance. You are only allowed to use sections that are of direct relevance to your argument. ..."

"At this point I think we are okay as far as copyright goes ... if Korzenik does find sections of cited material that are not clearly relevant to the argument, the worst that will happen is that he will ask you to paraphrase, or omit points of possible contention."

"... I think we are in the clear."

p.5: "As I hope I argued cogently above, copyright is not going to be a problem. ... it is my impression (and hope) that we will not need to make many (if any) changes."

p.5: "'The term 'unreasonably' is so vague that it is not clear to me what, if any, protection this gives me against changes in the manuscript.' ... This clause refers only to the subtitle."

p.6: "The text ... will not be changed without your express consent ..."

12/14/98, p.2. "Korzenik ~~does~~ does not foresee any big problems regarding legal liability in your book. A further assurance, I hope, is that I have demonstrated the consistent intent to maintain the integrity of Truth versus Lies."

BF to TJK

12/29/98, p.1. "As for acquiring copyright permission ... I hope that the copyright laws about letters and the defense of one's reputation will make this unnecessary."

3/20/99, ^{p.1} "Truth versus Lies" will not come out until you are satisfied with the state in which it is to be distributed."

"... [Miller and Korzenik] have not found too many red flags."

p.2. "[Miller] told me that there were not too many instances of citations that would be construable as copyright infringement, although some of the letters from your brother, and his stories, may require abridgement to make them qualify as fair use. Miller stressed that such edits would in no way compromise the tenor or comprehensiveness of the arguments."

4/7/99, ^{p.1} "I have not developed a new position with regard to potential defamation suits ... They are indeed hard to win, and I doubt that there are any real problems on this front. ... It is not my impression that there are serious libel problems."

p.3. "Between fair-use and whatever strategy we settle on to acquire permission (or circumvent the necessity) I am sure there will be no impasses."

Miller to B.F., 4/1/99, p.3. "If the Wanda and David writings are used with discretion, the fair use exception should be available. In that case,

permission would not have to be obtained."

B.F. to TJK, 7/16/99, p. 2. "We still do not have clear indication of the remaining work to do with regard to sections that need rewriting."

B.F. to TJK, 7/19/99, ^{p. 1, #2} "Unfortunately this material ... will have to be paraphrased."

TJK to B.F. 7/26/99, ^{p. 4} "You say that 'this material' will have to be paraphrased. I assume that by 'this material' you mean my quotations from my brother's letters in Chapt. XV."

B.F. to TJK. 8/2/99. p. 2, #5 answers my letter of 7/26/99, but does not contradict the assumption I stated in that letter.

B.F. to TJK, 8/7/99, p.3, ¶4: "There are no more libel or defamation issues."

B.F. to TJK, 8/31/99, p.2, ^{¶1} "I thought you might like to know that there are no remaining legal issues with regard to the publication of Truth versus Lies."

B.F. to TJK, 9/1/99, p.1, ¶4 "There was nothing in your corrections that I took issue with, and the changes will be entered this weekend. Miller will then read through the page proofs to make sure everything is okay from the legal standpoint. The few points upon which I waver are instances where you have supplied alternatives. So, if Miller wants a change, it's there."

↑ "Libel and copyright problems with the book may prove challenging. So it may take months before we can agree on a satisfactory text."

- #53 5/31/99, p.1, #2. "I think we should wait until we've arrived at a mutually satisfactory version of the text, and only after that should you make any arrangements that subject us to time constraints."
- 3/27/99, p.8, #3. "I urge your lawyers to contact Denvir to discuss this with him." ("this" = the problem of letting Friedlander's lawyers see my documents)
- #54 6/10/99, p.2, #6 + p.3, #1. "I repeat my suggestion that you should call off your date with your printer until we have a text for the book that we can both agree on. I think we're going to have to take considerable time and trouble to get all the legal problems worked out."
- #58 6/22/99, p.2, #1. "I think you should cancel your date with your printer and not make a new one until we have a satisfactory text prepared."
- #59 6/23/99, p.2, #6. "As you can see, it will take us a while to get all this crap [legal problems] worked out, not to mention other problems, so I really think you should cancel your date with the printer."
- #61 7/8/99, p.2, #4. "I won't approve any changes in the text until I've seen a complete copy of what you are going to send to the printer, and have had the opportunity to give it a careful reading."
- #61 7/8/99, p.4, postscript. I suggested a conference call between me, Denvir, Clarke, and Friedlander's lawyers.
- #63 7/12/99, "NOTE ON THE QUESTION OF MILLER'S AND KORZENIK'S ACCESS TO DOCUMENTS." I suggested a conference call between me, Denvir,

Clark, Korzenik, Friedlander, and Miller. I listed all the legal problems to be considered.

#65 7/20/99, p. 2, ¶ 2, "I urge you to set up that conference call..."

Conference call took place on Sept. 7.

[\$ 10.70 My phone balance

[The following is the message I read into Beau Friedlander's answering machine at a few minutes after 12:00 noon on October 3, 1999 (12:00 noon my time, not NY time)
This is Ted Kaczynski speaking.

Beau: If you think I am going to accept those changes in the book, then you are out of your mind. I most certainly will not accept them, and you will not publish the book in the form of which you have sent me copies. Tomorrow I will send you a letter on this subject.

1
O - 212-233-4880

044-897-085

36

118

Any copies of my book that may already have been printed, have been printed in violation of our contract, because I have not approved the changes. Therefore, the printing of the book constitutes infringement of my copyright. All such copies of the book must be destroyed ~~immediately~~, otherwise I will consider taking legal action. By the way, I now have a good prospect of getting an intellectual-property lawyer who will work for me on a contingency fee.

10/9/98, p.1, #3. "My principal concern is that the contract should prescribe that no changes will be made in the book without my permission."

11/1/98, p.1, #1. "I'll add that it seems to me that we ought to settle the main sticking point, the copyright problem, before we sign a contract."

12/23/98, p.5, #4. "I don't see any objection to having Korzenik do the legal read-through now, even though that's not the customary order in which things are done."

12/28/98, p.2, #3. "... it would be very helpful if you would make sure always to explain things to me fully, notify me of any deadlines as far in advance as possible — in short, keep me well informed about what is going on, and get information to me as early as possible ..."

1/21/99, p.2, #2. "So you can just go ahead with publication of Truth vs Lies."

TED KACZYNSKI
to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

October 3, 1999

87

Dear Beau,

You have fucked things up good.

Most importantly, you kept telling me in effect that no significant changes would have to be made in Truth versus Lies due to libel problems. See your letters to me, 10/21/98, p. 1, ¶ 2; 10/22/98, p. 1, ¶ 1, 2; 10/29/98, p. 1, ¶ 3; 11/4/98, p. 1, ¶ 2; 4/7/99, p. 1, ¶ 3. Your statements about copyright problems were more cautious, but they still gave the impression that deletions of copyrighted material would be modest. See your letters to me, 9/4/98, p. 1, ¶ 3; 9/21/98, p. 1, ¶ 2; 10/20/98, p. 2, ¶ 3, 4; 11/23/98, p. 3, ¶ 2-4, p. 5, ¶ 1; 12/14/98, p. 2, ¶ 4; 12/29/98, p. 1, ¶ 5; 3/20/99, p. 2, ¶ 2; 4/7/99, p. 3, ¶ 1. (Also see letter from Miller to Friedlander, 4/1/99, p. 3, ¶ 4, of which you sent me a copy.) In your letter to me of 7/19/99, p. 1, ¶ 2, you wrote, "Unfortunately this material ... will have to be paraphrased." From the context it appeared that the foregoing statement referred only to the quoted material in Chapter XV, and I wrote you on 7/26/99, page 4, "You say that 'this material' will have to be paraphrased. I assume that by 'this material' you mean my quotations from my brother's letters in Chapter XV." You did not correct this assumption in your answering letter (8/2/99), which implied your acceptance of the assumption. More important than any of the foregoing, you wrote me on 8/7/99, p. 3, ¶ 4: "There

are no more libel or defamation issues." And on 8/31/99, p.2, #1, you wrote me, "I thought you might like to know that there are no remaining legal issues with regard to the publication of Truth versus Lies."

But, in spite of these assurances, the proofs that you sent me in late September contained several very important deletions of quoted material, as well as changes made because of libel issues, that had never been mentioned to me previously. When I received these proofs I became very angry at you, because I could think of only three plausible explanations: Either you were incompetent (which I do not believe is the case), or your lawyer was incompetent (and you've assured me he is extremely competent), or else you had been bullshitting me about the extent of the legal changes that would have to be made: Because you were afraid that I would not accept the changes, you put off informing me of them until the book was already set in type, thinking that I would agree to the changes when I was faced with what was almost a fait accompli.

However, after I had cooled down somewhat (which took me a long time), I reflected that there might be some explanation other than incompetence or deception on your part — even though I was unable to

think of one.

So I await your explanation. You had better come up with a good one, because the facts as stated above constitute pretty strong prima facie ~~new~~ evidence of either incompetence on your part or your lawyers', or else deception on your part. Since my arrest I've had more than I can take of bullshit, deviousness, and broken promises, and I won't work with anyone who isn't strictly honest with me.

Ted

P.S. In my letter #83 (9/18/99), p-6, I expressed some wonderment at the fact that your lawyers hadn't done any trimming of the quotations I used prior to Chapter XV. It now appears that you simply weren't telling me about the deletions that your lawyers had recommended in that part of the book. And that in fact they had cut that material far more heavily than I would have expected.

—T.

P.P.S. In any case, whatever your explanation may be, the changes you want to make in the book are unacceptable.

—T.

LEO MALCZYNSKI
to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

#88

OCTober 7, 1999

Dear Beau,

Today I was interviewed by
and she put in a good word for you. In fact,
she put in a number of very good words for
you, so that I'm not at all sure that I'm
still mad at you. But I still want to hear
your explanation.

By the way, you may recall that I sent ~~copy of your undated to~~ Quin Denvir a
copy of your undated letter of assurances. His
opinion is that you and your lawyer were
cavalier in dealing with my legal concerns,
and that I have a right to demand more than
your letter gives me before I send you
the documents.

Awaiting your explanation,

Ted

to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

#89

October 12, 1999

Dear Beau,

Concerning Jeffrey Miller's letter to me of 10/1/99: He states that Context "will take all reasonable good faith steps..." etc. But I have no idea what the phrase "reasonable good faith steps" means. The expression is so vague that I'm not sure it has any meaning at all. I think you will appreciate that my understanding of "reasonable good faith" in this context may be very different from yours.

Having discussed this matter with Quin Denvir and Judy Clarke, I propose that we make the following addendum to our contract:

The phrase, "Theodore J. Kaczynski's documents" shall refer to any documents that are covered by attorney-client privilege as between Theodore J. Kaczynski and any attorneys who have ever represented him, any work-product created by any attorneys who have ever represented him, and any documents seized by any law-enforcement agencies in a search of Theodore J. Kaczynski's home.

In the event of any lawsuit resulting from the publication of Truth versus Lies, if any party to the suit makes a legal effort to obtain access to any part of Theodore J. Kaczynski's documents, other than those parts of such documents that are quoted or specifically cited in Truth versus Lies, then

Simulacrum, Inc.¹ agrees to pay all fees of such legal counsel as Kaczynski may select for the purpose of resisting the aforesaid efforts to obtain access to parts of Theodore J. Kaczynski's documents.

Moreover, if Simulacrum, Inc. should receive notice of any lawsuit connected with Truth versus Lies, it will immediately forward a copy of such notice to Kaczynski by express mail. Kaczynski will then be entitled to retain an attorney who will prepare to resist any efforts that may thereafter be made to obtain access to parts of Kaczynski's documents as described above, and Simulacrum, Inc. will promptly pay this attorney's retainer, and will be responsible for payment of all his fees, even if it should turn out that no efforts are ever made to obtain access to any parts of Kaczynski's documents.

* * * * *

The reason for the provision in the last paragraph is this: If there is a lawsuit, and if a subpoena is issued for some of my documents, it may take me a while to find an attorney who will resist the subpoena for me. The court may not be willing to wait for a couple of months while I look

1. This is the correct name of your company, right?

for an attorney; it may insist on prompt enforcement of the subpoena. So I should have an attorney who is ready to step in immediately to resist the subpoena. Your attorneys won't do for this purpose, since there may be conflict of interest.

By the way, I want to mention that Quin Denvir and Judy Clarke do not feel comfortable discussing these issues with Jeffrey Miller, because they are not formally representing me in this civil matter but are only advising me about it privately and informally. I had suggested that you and your lawyers should directly contact Denvir and Clarke mainly just to save time, since it's time-consuming for me to learn of problems from you, write to Denvir and Clarke about them, wait for their answer, and then get back to you.

But I think Denvir and Clarke would be happier if your lawyers would refrain from discussing our issues with them directly. However, it would be helpful if, whenever you or your lawyers send me a letter bearing on our legal problems, you would send a copy to Denvir simultaneously. This procedure would help to save time, and I don't think that Denvir or Clarke would object to it.

I expect to write you another letter quite soon.

Best regards,

Ted

cc: Quin Denvir

to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

#89 A

October 11, 1999

Dear Beau,

I have not yet received your answer to my letter #87, but while I'm waiting for it, I'll answer some points from your recent letters.

9/24/99, p. 4, ¶3. You write, "My feeling has been that the kinds of changes that you might want to make at this point (if any) would be small."

Yet, without consulting me, or even giving me any prior notification, you introduced major deletions of quoted material, and of material that Miller apparently considered potentially libelous, going far beyond the deletions that I had already approved. Knowing as you did that it was very important to me that the book should be solidly documented, how could you assume that I would accept all this without wanting to change any of it?

9/24/99, p. 4, ¶4. Thanks for reassuring me that you will respect the terms of our contract.

9/24/99, p. 5, P.P.S. Since I'm still very sore at you, this is not a propitious time for congratulating you on your engagement, but I'll make an effort to sort of squash down my resentment just long enough to congratulate you anyway. As for [redacted], I'm not sure whether I should offer her my congratulations or my commiseration, but I'll try to be optimistic and offer her my congratulations. Okay, I apologize for the acid humor.

9/30/99, p. 1, ¶2. After further consultation with Q. Denvir, I've concluded that there will

be no very serious risk in quoting the 1979 Autobiography. I am "having second thoughts about the entire project," to use your expression, but it's not because of any legal risks, it's because I'm just burned out. I'm sick to death of all this shit.* So much so that for more than a week I've been finding it extremely difficult to force myself to put pen to paper for any other purpose than to write purely social letters. And now, after I've spent a vast amount of time and energy in corresponding with you during a year and some odd months, it may turn out that it will be all for nothing, because it's not clear that we will ever reach agreement on the conditions of publication.

9/24/99, p.4, ¶3, and 9/30/99, p.1, ¶2. You write that you "assumed that [you] had [my] faith at this point," and that you "overestimated [my] sense of [your] reliability." If you'll stop and think for a moment, you'll see why I have not been very impressed with your reliability. For example, you wrote me on 10/22/98, "We [B. Friedlander + attorney] went over all of the points that he felt could present stumbling blocks [with regard to libel issues] and found that they were mirages;" on 10/29/98, "I do think I put the libel issue to rest in my letter of the 21st...;" on 11/4/98, "I understand the libel issue to be a moot one..." This

* Not just the problems with the book, but a lot of others.

seems clearly to say that no changes in the book, or at least no significant ones, would be required because of libel problems. Yet you later did ask for significant deletions or other changes because of libel risks. Put yourself in my position: Would this encourage you to have confidence in your correspondent's reliability?

Contrary to my advice (letter # 53, 5/31/99, p. 1, ¶ 2) you kept announcing publication dates for Truth versus Lies (first June, then August, then September, then October) without apparently considering whether there was any certainty that you would actually be able to meet those dates. No wonder people now doubt that the book will ever be published. Put yourself in the position of an outside observer; Would you have confidence in the reliability of a person who kept announcing dates and then failing to meet them?

My personal opinion is that you do things in too much of a damned hurry, which results in sloppiness, careless judgments, or careless statements, hence in the appearance or reality of unreliability. It may be that your hurried style of action is necessary for your success in business, but from my point of view it is a source of problems.

* * *

By the way, because my anger has cooled considerably, because of what you've written me in your latest letters, and because of

4
good things that has said concerning you, I no longer suspect you of intentionally bullshitting me about the extent of the legal changes that would have to be made in Truth vs Lies; I think the difficulties we have are the result of your excessive haste, with consequent carelessness. But I see no reason why this would have had to happen if you had taken my advice (#53, 5/31/99, p. 1, #2) and refrained from subjecting us to time constraints before we had all the problems worked out. Then there would have been no need for haste.

* * *

Your letter of 10/4/99. Thanks for reassuring me about the nature of your publicity efforts. Regarding , in #86 I said that she had tried to peddle her article to the Boston Globe and possibly to Harper's.

had given me that impression, but it turns out that it is false. a has explained that, at the request of the editors of Green Anarchist, she had only called the attention of a Globe reporter to the article in Green Anarchist and read him a statement on the subject, of which she sent me a copy. So I don't see that she is seriously at fault here.

I've seen no clear signs that has an excessive appetite for publicity. You and tell me that she does, but you've given me no solid evidence of it, so I remain skeptical. Or

rather, I've again become skeptical since learning that she did not after all offer her article to the Globe.

* * *

Did you get from Dubner copies of the tapes of our interview? If so, I would appreciate it if you would send copies of them to Quin Denvir. Also, I would appreciate receiving a copy of Dubner's article.

* * *

On the dust jacket of Truth versus Lies you wrote, "In Truth versus Lies, Kaczynski particularly states the case against allegations that he is a paranoid schizophrenic." This is false, and please do not say it! It would give people the impression that what's in Truth versus Lies is the best I can do against the claim of paranoid schizophrenia, which is not at all true. The purpose of Truth versus Lies is only to refute some of the bullshit that my family and the media have spread about me. A proper argument on the schizophrenia question would include an examination of the shrinks' reports and the reasons for doubting the validity of those reports. Truth vs Lies simply does not address the schizophrenia issue, even though it does contain material that has a bearing on that issue.

* * *

As for Ulveman — ask about him. She knows more than I do about that

matter,

Best regards,

Ted

TED KACZYNSKI
to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

October 19, 1999

#90

Dear Beau,

I quote from some of your letters to me:

7/19/99, page 2, ¶12. "I know a guy named Steven Dubner who is writing an article about David and Linda P. provisionally entitled 'The Price of Morality,' which is critical of the couple and particularly of Linda. He described them ~~me~~ to me as 'angry Buddhists' and rightly hypothesizes that David went from your shadow to Linda's and that he has no backbone but much resentment."

8/2/99, page 1, ¶15. "Dubner called today. ... La Follette did reinforce the idea that David once held radical views. Dubner said that this was ancillary to his argument, but it would receive fair treatment as it applies to his thesis about the triangulation between you, David and Linda Patrik."

8/7/99, page 1, ¶12. "I had a long conversation with the Talk Magazine editor who is working on the article entitled 'The Price of Morality.' Here's what I learned: The article will portray you as a person guided by his own strict moral principles. It will make clear that you developed your own code of values and beliefs, and that they form a cogent system. It will then show how David once subscribed to a similar moral position. ..."

8/7/99, page 1, ¶13. "Dubner's focus is on

the relationship between you and your brother and how morality played a role in the decisions you each made. ... He plans to expose David's earlier radicalism and his journey toward an establishment mind set. ... [T]he editor told me that David has been recalcitrant during the interviews with Dubner. ... "

8/7/99, page 2, ¶ 2. "Talk [Magazine] wants to break the story about your brother's wishy-washy morals."

8/7/99, page 2, ¶ 4, page 3, ¶ 1. "Since [Dubner's] article represents a turning of the tide with regard to press coverage, it should, in my opinion, be accommodated. ... [W]e know what Talk is going to run My opinion about the article is that it will be important; I think Dubner is on a par with William Finnegan."

8/7/99, page 3, ¶ 3. "Dubner interviewed [Joel] Schwartz and will comment on the meaning of David's opinions regarding schizophrenia. He was fascinated by the information from your book on that score."

~~Now compare the foregoing with what Dubner actually wrote in his article, which is just one~~

Dubner wrote in his letter to me of 8/2/99, page 1, ¶ 2-4: "I was particularly surprised by the influence that Linda has

always exercised over David's decision-making and David's very complicated feelings for you, which seem to have vacillated between love and hatred. ... [M]uch of what you write about David (and Linda) seems to corroborate my own impressions. ... I would especially like you to be able to explain directly to me and to readers your feelings about and your experiences with David, especially such statements as 'David has never had any fixed attitudes, beliefs, or principles.'"

* * *

Now compare the foregoing with what Dubner actually wrote in his article, which, as is customary in the media, portrays me insultingly and Dave and Linda as almost saintly.

As I assume you realize, the reason why I agreed to let Dubner interview me was that, on the basis of what he wrote to me and apparently told you, and your belief that he could be trusted,¹ I thought he would provide independent support for my conclusions about Dave's and Linda's motivations and the relationship between Dave and Linda. But he does no such thing. He says nothing about Dave's dependence on Linda, and everything substantial

1. You certainly conveyed the impression that Dubner could be trusted. Only in your letter of September 19 — long after the interview was over — did you express reservations.

that he says about Dave's resentment is accompanied by phrases like, "Ted said...", so that all he does is mention my opinion without providing any support for it. In fact, he discourages the reader from taking my opinion seriously, since he describes Dave and Linda as "honorable" and me as "cruel," "self-important," and "manipulative." Given the documentation available to him in Truth versus Lies, I can only assume that he designed the article to suit his own journalistic purpose rather than to give the best attainable approximation to the truth.

This interview is disastrous. Many hit-pieces about me have been written before, but this one is very much worse, because the fact that Dubner has interviewed me gives his words vastly more authority than they would have otherwise. And you tell me in your letter of October 11 that Dubner is now going to give at least one TV interview, through which he will no doubt propagate further misrepresentations of my motives and characterizations of me as "trouble," "cruel," "self-important," and "manipulative," while portraying Dave and Linda as noble and moral.

In your October 11 letter you wrote, "Overall, I think the piece Dubner published was good." I would appreciate it if you would go over each of the statements that I

quoted above, pages 1-3, and explain to me how those statements were fulfilled in Dubner's article.

What disturbs me is not so much the fact that you advised me to trust Dubner. That might have meant only that you screwed up and got "took". I too screwed up and got "took", ~~than~~ since I should have had more sense than to take your advice about Dubner. What really disturbs me is the fact that you say Dubner's piece is "good". From this fact I can only conclude that either (1) you read the piece very carelessly; (2) you don't want to admit that you screwed up in advising me to trust Dubner; or (3) your conception of the kind of publicity that should be made for Truth versus Lies is one that is unfavorable to me and that portrays Dave and Linda as only a little less than saints—in defiance of certain facts documented in Truth versus Lies.

Best regards,

Ted

to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

#90 A

Dear Beau,

In your letter of October 12 you express disappointment that you don't have my "faith and respect." I'm not sure what you mean. If you mean that you would have expected me to accept uncritically everything that you do, then I think the expectation was unreasonable. Would you accept uncritically everything that I might do? Since my arrest I have trusted people again and again. Again and Again my trust has proved to have been a mistake: Denvir, Clarke & Co.; their hired shrinks; Greenberg, Mello, Bonnie; journalists like Christine Craft and Peter Klebnikov, among others. Would you seriously expect me now to trust anyone more than I have to?¹

It must be clear to you by now that while we get along very well in a personal sense, we have big problems with regard to the handling of practical affairs. To me your style of action appears hasty and overconfident, and consequently careless. The result of this that bothers me most is that

1. The one person whom I trust without reservation is
I think I have good reasons to trust her more than anyone else, yet even in her case I'll have to admit that my trust is not entirely rational, but is based partly on the fact that I need to have someone whom I can trust completely.

you say things that later turn out to be inaccurate. (E.g., your assurances about libel problems, your repeated setting of publication dates that couldn't be met, and now your implied assurance that Dubner would write the kinds of things you said he would write.) Equally serious, your ideas about publicity and the media are at odds with mine.

In your letter of October 4, page 2, ¶3, you wrote, "Nothing that I consider valid in the promotion of your book, including [60 Minutes], would go beyond the selling of your book. That is how books are sold."

Correction: That is how a very small minority of high-profile books are sold. I feel safe in assuming that of all the titles published in the U.S. each year, only a small percentage are ever discussed on national TV shows.

Anyway, the long and the short of it is that I don't want you to manufacture a public image for me, whether intentionally or as a by-product of the selling of the book. I don't know whether that was going to happen, but I'm worried that it might happen. So I'm putting you on notice that I will hereafter give no interviews for mainstream media, and that I don't want you to make any public statements about me personally (as opposed to statements about the book).

I'm certain that you're quite sincere

when you say that you care about me, but at the same time your understanding of me is incomplete and your goals, values, and judgments are very different from mine. That's why I'm worried about what you're going to do with publicity.

So where do we go from here?

~~Here's~~ Here's what I propose:

1. The last-minute changes that Miller made in T.v.L. are to be undone, except that Miller, if he likes, can propose some changes that are far less extensive. If this is okay with you, let me know, and I'll fix up the text to suit myself, incorporating those of Miller's changes that I feel are acceptable. If the text then suits you too, we will at last have an agreed-upon text.

2. We should prepare an addendum to the contract along the lines that I proposed in my letter #89.

3. Until steps 1 and 2 are completed, we will not know definitely that Context will ever publish T.v.L. Hence, until steps 1 and 2 are completed:

(a) You make no statements to the media about me or about T.v.L., and you answer all questions with "no comment"

(b) With or without a confidentiality agreement, you give no one a copy of T.v.L. without my consent.

(c) No excerpts from T.V.L. are to be offered to any periodicals.

4. After steps 1 and 2 are completed, you can go ahead with publicity, but I will not participate in your publicity campaign. Publicity is to be about the book only and not about me personally.

5. If we can't arrive at agreement in regard to items 1 through 4, then we will terminate the contract. Many months ago I had an offer from another publisher (not Regnery), and more recently they sent me a reminder, so if you want to terminate the contract I won't have a problem with that.

* * *

Please let me know how you feel about the foregoing proposals.

If you have copies of the tapes of the Dubner interview, please send copies of them to Quin Denvir. Thanks.

* * *

Okay, let's be at peace. I'm still upset about recent events, but by and by I'll get over being sore at you.

Best regards,

Ted

P.S. Here's an idea that I forgot to mention. I understand that one can protect oneself from a libel suit in the following way: If you're going to publish negative allegations about X, you give X a chance to answer the allegations. If X answers, you publish his answers along with the allegations. If X declines to answer, you can publish the allegations without fear of a libel suit.²

Maybe this could be applied to T.v.L. as follows: You, as publisher of T.v.L., assume the role of a "neutral reporter." You're publishing my allegations. You offer to certain people mentioned in the book the right to respond. If they do respond, you publish their responses in the same volume. Even if this would not protect me from a libel suit (which I don't care about), maybe it would protect you from a libel suit. You might want to ask Miller about this.

- Ted

P.P.S. A couple of points that I forgot to cover:

(i) In my letter #86, page 1, ¶2, I wrote, "I can't ask you not to exercise your First-Amendment

2. I received this information from Fischler and Sucher.

rights with regard to me" I've changed my mind about that. As noted above, I am asking you not to exercise your First-Amendment rights in regard to me. I think this is justified, because if you hadn't gotten involved in publishing my book it's unlikely that you would ever have made any public comments about me anyway. Any ~~po~~ public comments about me that you might make henceforward would be an outcome of your publication of T.V.L.

(ii) On pages 1 and 2 of Letter # 90, I quoted some passages from your letters to me.

(a) Can I have your permission to quote these same passages in Truth vs Lies? To avoid causing you embarrassment, I will avoid using your name and refer to you only as "Mr. X." (b) Can you confirm that the passages quoted on pages 1 and 2 of Letter #90 accurately reflect what you were told by Dubner and by representatives of Talk Magazine.

(iii) I have learned that the statements I made about . on page 2 of Letter #86 were incorrect: She offered her article neither to the Boston Globe nor to Harpers. I was misled by something that Blake Davis told me.

Ted

CERTIFIED ARTICLE NUMBER
Z 326 825 757

Theodore John Kaczynski
04475-046
U.S. Penitentiary Max
P.O. Box 8500
Florence CO 81226-8500

October 26, 1999

Beau Friedlander
Context Books
368 Broadway, Suite 314
New York NY 10013

Dear Beau,

Your letter of October 19, 1999, page 2, makes it clear that your lawyers are insisting on revisions in Truth versus Lies that are so extensive that they are completely unacceptable to me. There is not the slightest chance that we will be able to reach agreement concerning the revisions required by your lawyers.

Accordingly, I hereby terminate my contract of February 1, 1999 with Context Books, a division of Simulacrum Llc, d/b/a Context Media, pursuant to paragraph 2.c.(ii) of said contract. Termination is effective as of today's date, October 26, 1999. This letter constitutes the written notice required by paragraph 2.c.(ii) of the contract.

October 26, 1999

Theodore John Kaczynski

TED KACZYNSKI
to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

October 27, 1999

92

Dear Beau,

In closing, as it were, I'd like to cover a couple of points connected with our recent correspondence.

In my letter #87 (with a reminder in #88) I asked you for an explanation of the fact that you've told me certain things that have later turned out not to be true. For example, in your letter of 8/31/99, page 2, paragraph 1, you wrote, "there are no remaining legal issues with regard to the publication of Truth versus Lies," yet a few weeks later you asked for some very important additional legal edits, and it appears from your letter of 10/19/99, page 2, paragraph 2 (lines 5 and 6, from the bottom of the paragraph) that you are still insisting that those items be paraphrased or summarized. Yet you have not explained this discrepancy between your words of 8/31/99 and your subsequent action.

I'm willing to give you the benefit of the doubt and assume that you ^{wrote} ~~spoke~~ recklessly rather than dishonestly on 8/31/99. But you certainly did lie in your letter of 10/4/99 to Warden Pugh. On page 2, paragraph 3 of that letter you stated that Jeffrey Miller was my legal counsel on issues associated with the publication of the book. This is false and you know it. In fact, you wrote in your letter of 10/19/99, page 1, paragraph 2: "Miller and Korzenik represent Context Books, and

their responsibilities are limited to protecting [Beau Friedlander] from a lawsuit," and, page 2, paragraph 3, "[Miller] is not your lawyer." Moreover, it has been my understanding for some time that Miller would not be able to represent me, because his doing so would involve conflict of interest.

Though you told the above lie to Warden Pugh and not to me, the lie is potentially harmful to me, because after the authorities here learn that you have falsely told them that Miller was my counsel, when I later want a visit from some other lawyer who really is my counsel, he may have difficulty getting in to see me because the prison authorities will be suspicious of ~~the~~ the legitimacy of his relationship with me.

Also in your letter of 10/4/99 you wrote, "Mr. Dubner is currently trying to place the same article with Time Magazine. This depends only on permission from Mr. Kaczynski, which has been requested." This too is false. My permission was never requested for publication of Dubner's article in Time Magazine, nor did I ever give such permission.

In your letter of 10/19/99, page 2, paragraph 3, you point out that the "new issues", i.e. those having to do with a possible impact on my appeal, are not covered by the terms of our contract. You're

3.
TJK to Friedlander
10/27/99

quite right. But it's also true that your lawyers' request for certain documents of mine is not covered by the terms of our contract. You'll recall that the "new issues" arose in response to your lawyers' request for the documents. I was asking for certain assurances (related to the "new issues") from you as a quid pro quo for giving your lawyers the documents. All this was external to the contract.

Actually, on the "new issues" I would have been willing to yield, if that had been necessary in order to get the book published and if things had been going alright in other respects. As I said during our conference call with Miller, Denver, and Clarke, since I've put so much time and effort into this book, if I have to take a certain risk in order to publish it, then I'll take that risk. The risk is probably a moot question anyway, since everyone agrees that my chances of winning a new trial are very slim. Thus the real problem is not the "new issues" but the extensive revisions in Truth versus Lies that your lawyers demand and that, in my opinion, would seriously weaken the argument.

We both would have been better off if you had been completely frank with me from the beginning about the amount of material that your lawyers wanted to delete (or replace with summaries and paraphrases), and if you had

PPIC-101
held off on the publicity until it had been definitely determined that we would be able to reach agreement on the legal revisions.

I would appreciate it if you would return my family photo. Best to send it to Quin Denver. Thanks.

Regards,

Ted

MAILED NOV 21 1999
to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

October 21, 1999

92

Dear Beau,

In closing, as it were, I'd like to cover a couple of points connected with our recent correspondence.

In my letter #87 (with a reminder in #88) I asked you for an explanation of the fact that you've told me certain things that have later turned out not to be true. For example, in your letter of 8/31/99, page 2, paragraph 1, you wrote, "there are no remaining legal issues with regard to the publication of Truth versus Lies," yet a few weeks later you asked for some very important additional legal edits, and it appears from your letter of 10/19/99, page 2, paragraph 2 (lines 5 and 6 from the bottom of the paragraph) that you are still insisting that those items be paraphrased or summarized. Yet you have not explained this discrepancy between your words of 8/31/99 and your subsequent action.

I'm willing to give you the benefit of the doubt and assume that you ^{wrote} ~~spoke~~ recklessly rather than dishonestly on 8/31/99. But you certainly did lie in your letter of 10/4/99 to Warden Pugh. On page 2, paragraph 3 of that letter you stated that Jeffrey Miller was my legal counsel on issues associated with the publication of the book. This is false and you know it. In fact, you wrote in your letter of 10/19/99, page 1, paragraph 2: "Miller and Korzenik represent Context Books, and

their responsibilities are limited to protecting [Beau Friedlander] from [a lawsuit, " and, page 2, paragraph 3, "[Miller] is not your lawyer." Moreover, it has been my understanding for some time that Miller would not be able to represent me, because his doing so would involve conflict of interest.

Though you told the above lie to Warden Pugh and not to me, the lie is potentially harmful to me, because after the authorities here learn that you have falsely told them that Miller was my counsel, when I later want a visit from some other lawyer who really is my counsel, he may have difficulty getting in to see me because the prison authorities will be suspicious of ~~the~~ the legitimacy of his relationship with me.

Also in your letter of 10/4/99 you wrote, "Mr. Dubner is currently trying to place the same article with Time Magazine. This depends only on permission from Mr. Kaczynski, which has been requested." This too is false. My permission was never requested for publication of Dubner's article in Time Magazine, nor did I ever give such permission.

In your letter of 10/19/99, page 2, paragraph 3, you point out that the "new issues", i.e. those having to do with a possible impact on my appeal, are not covered by the terms of our contract. You're

quite right. But it's also true that your lawyers' request for certain documents of mine is not covered by the terms of our contract. You'll recall that the "new issues" arose in response to your lawyers' request for the documents. I was asking for certain assurances (related to the "new issues") from you as a quid pro quo for giving your lawyers the documents. All this was external to the contract.

Actually, on the "new issues" I would have been willing to yield, if that had been necessary in order to get the book published and if things had been going alright in other respects. As I said during our conference call with Miller, Denvir, and Clarke, since I've put so much time and effort into this book, if I have to take a certain risk in order to publish it, then I'll take that risk. The risk is probably a moot question anyway, since everyone agrees that my chances of winning a new trial are very slim. Thus the real problem is not the "new issues" but the extensive revisions in Truth versus Lies that your lawyers demand and that, in my opinion, would seriously weaken the argument.

We both would have been better off if you had been completely frank with me from the beginning about the amount of material that your lawyers wanted to delete (or replace with summaries and paraphrases), and if you had

held off on the publicity until it had been definitely determined that we would be able to reach agreement on the legal revisions.

I would appreciate it if you would return my family photo. Best to send it to Quin, Denvir. Thanks.

Regards,

Ted

TED KALCZYNSKI
to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

[Never sent]

November 3, 1999

#93

Dear Beau,

Thank you for the \$150. It was deposited to my account on October 28, but I didn't know who had sent it until November 2, because I was so busy getting motions prepared in time to meet the legal deadline that I put your envelope aside and didn't read your note until I finished with the motions yesterday.*

I'll have to admit that your generosity makes me feel a little guilty. I'm sorry that things have turned out the way they have. I'd also like to say that I have no hard feelings toward you, or at least no very serious ones. I think you're basically a decent and kindly person, and any resentful feelings I still have are outweighed by my favorable feelings toward you.

Warm regards,

Ted

*When someone sends me a money order the officers take it from the envelope and deposit it in my account, then send the envelope on to me without the money order but with a slip indicating the deposit. I learned of the deposit from a statement of my account that I requested because I needed it for the motions.

IED KALZYNSKI
to
JEFFREY MILLER

November 5, 1999

Dear Mr. Miller:

I respond to your letter of November 1, which I received yesterday.

On page 1 you write: "It has been made clear to you in Beau Friedlander's letter of October 19, and in all the correspondence generally, that Context is more than willing to work with you to arrive at a manuscript that will be both satisfactory to you and Context and legally protected as well."

On the contrary, Beau wrote in his October 19 letter to me, page 2, ¶12 (which I cited in my note of October 26): "My lawyers requested changes for all of the material constituting copyright infringement, Specifically [sic], that these sections be appropriately paraphrased or that a factual summary be written in lieu of that material, and this meant everything for which we were not granted permission to reprint." Since my brother and mother refused permission, this clearly and unequivocally states that you are asking to delete virtually all of my brother's and mother's writings from the book, and replace them with paraphrases or summaries. This is so far beyond what is acceptable to me, that Beau's statement of this position showed that no agreement was possible between us. Hence, by the terms of the contract, I clearly had the right to terminate, and no lack of good faith on my part was indicated. Your concept of "good faith" seems to be that I must agree to everything that you demand.

As for Beau's ~~note~~^{letter} to me of October 26, I had not received it at the time I wrote my note to him of the same date.

As for your claim that it was made clear "in the correspondence generally" that Context was "willing to work with" me, etc., etc., I don't give that any weight, since the assurances that Beau has offered in his correspondence have proved unreliable, and when they've subsequently been corrected, they've been corrected to my disadvantage. For example, in some of my fairly recent letters (I don't have time to look them up now; you can dig them up yourself, or I'll look up the citations for you after I've got my current brief filed) I cited statements from some of Beau's early letters in which he clearly indicated that there were no libel problems with the book, and implied that the copyright problems were far less serious than they later turned out to be, in the opinion of his lawyers. Many of these statements were made by Beau before I signed the contract, and I signed the contract partly on the basis of those statements. So the bad faith here is on Beau's part, not mine.

As for item 2 in your letter of November 1, it is nonsense. As I made clear in my letter to Beau of October 27, 1999, I proposed that Context revise its agreement with me only as a quid pro quo for giving you the four documents that you had requested. The contract gives you

no right to insist that I deliver those or any other documents to you, I have no obligation of any kind to deliver them to you, and accordingly I can demand any quid pro quo that I choose in exchange for the documents. My decision to terminate the contract had nothing to do with the 4 documents or with the revision of the agreement that I proposed.

Your claim that I "insisted" that Context revise the contract is ridiculous. Look at the wording of my letters (#89, #90A). I wrote that I proposed an addition to the contract, and in #90A, page 4, I wrote, "Please let me know how you feel about the foregoing proposals." Obviously, therefore, I was presenting revision of the contract merely as a point for negotiation, not as a demand. Your claim that I "insist" on amending the contract is so obviously false that it is one of several points in your letter that clearly demonstrate your bad faith.

In fact: (a) I am perfectly willing to drop my proposal for revision of the contract, and any other similar requests or proposals, if you will drop your request for the four documents. (b) Even if you don't drop your request for the four documents, I am willing to negotiate about the quid pro quo that I will want in exchange for them. (c) I don't think this issue would be a major stumbling block; I think we could successfully negotiate it. The real problem is the

extent of the legal revisions that you want to make in Truth versus Lies. See my letter to Beau of October 27.

I did not terminate the contract in order to force an alteration of the contract. Your suggestion that I did so is pure fantasy and is unsupported by anything in my letters or elsewhere. If you think otherwise, then please cite the appropriate passages from my letters.

I did not "threaten to take the book elsewhere." I merely offered Beau an opportunity to get out of the contract if he so desired and indicated that I would have no problem with that since I could always get the book published elsewhere. This was in no sense a threat. In case you're interested, I have not carried on negotiations with any publisher other than Context. When the publisher whom I mentioned in my earlier letter wrote to me, I answered with a short note in which I politely declined his services. When he later sent me a reminder, I did not respond at all.

The clear truth is that early on, as is proven by his letters, Beau made statements to me that led me to reasonably believe that the legal revisions would be far less than what you are now asking. Beau made these statements to me in order to induce me to sign the contract. Under the circumstances, it is absurd for you to claim that I am showing lack of

good faith in exercising my right to terminate the contract on the grounds that I cannot accept legal revisions of the kind and extent that you are now asking. It is Beau, and not I, who has shown bad faith.

I terminated the contract legitimately and in good faith, and the contract ceased to have any force as of October 26, 1991, or at least as of the date on which you received my notice.

Let me digress for a moment to address the issue of time-pressure.

Beginning long before we signed the contract, Beau knew (as is proved by the correspondence) that I was involved in legal efforts related to my criminal case that would absorb much of my time and effort and would require me to meet legal deadlines.

Beau claims that certain time-limits must be met for business reasons in connection with the publication of the book. This may be true as far as I know, but it is Beau's own fault that we are under time-pressure.

Beau should not have begun publicizing the book and should not have taken any other action that committed him to publish the book, until after it had definitely been determined that we would be able to reach agreement as to the legal revisions, since there was no certainty that we would be able to reach such agreement.

or that I would not have occasion to exercise my right to terminate the contract.

When Beau began publicizing the book, and later when he made dates with his printer and his distributor, he did so without consulting me and without even giving me prior notice. In acting thus he took a gamble that we would be able to agree on the legal revisions, and do so within a certain period of time. (In my letter to Beau of May 31, 1999, I warned him about the danger of committing himself to time-constraints, but he ignored my warning.) Beau lost his gamble and now he expects me to pay the price for his folly. There would have been no time-pressure if Beau had been prudent enough to avoid publicizing the book, or in any other way committing himself to publish it, until we had reached agreement about the legal revisions.

Beau says the book has progressed slowly by industry standards. No doubt. But that is your and his fault. There were many months of delay before you completed the legal read-through and arranged the conference call with Denvir and Clarke. None of that was in any way my fault. Then, after many months of delay on your and Beau's part, roughly two months ago (I don't have the exact date; it can be determined from the correspondence, but I don't have time to look that up now) Beau suddenly began putting me under pressure to

get things done quickly; in effect, putting me under pressure to make up for lost time that you and he had squandered.

*

As I stated earlier, the contract has been validly terminated. However, I will be willing to sign an agreement to reinstate the contract, without any changes; provided that the following conditions are satisfied:

(i) We must negotiate a mutually satisfactory version of the text of Truth versus Lies. This will not be possible unless Beau is willing to back off a long way from the position he stated in his letter of 10/19/99 (see page 1, ¶ 3 of the present letter) that virtually all of my brother's and mother's writings must be replaced by paraphrases or summaries.

(ii) I have a brief to prepare in my criminal case, it is due on December 27, and even without doing any work with Context I will probably be hard-pressed to get it done in time. My consistent policy heretofore has been to give first priority to the legal work on my criminal case, second priority to my work with Context, and to give lower priority to all other work. I will continue this policy if you want to undertake further negotiation with me. But I will not bend to any Time-pressures that interfere with the legal work on my criminal case, or that would force us to do a slipshod

job of preparing a mutually acceptable text for Truth versus Lies. If this timing causes problems for Beau, then it's his own fault, since it was by his own choice that he took the gamble of prematurely committing himself to publish the book, and moreover he knew from the beginning that I had legal work that would take much of my time and subject me to deadlines.

(iii) Either you must drop your request for those 4 documents, or you must give me some quid pro quo that will compensate me for the legal risk that I take in giving you the documents. In all sincerity, I don't think this issue will be a major stumbling-block. I think we can reach agreement on it.

*

To summarize:

The plain truth, which is solidly substantiated by the correspondence, is that from the beginning until quite recently, Beau willfully or recklessly misled me about the amount of material in Truth versus Lies that his lawyers believed would have to be deleted, changed, or replaced with paraphrases or summaries. The provision allowing me to terminate the contract was intended for use in just such an eventuality (among others). Consequently, your claim that I am showing a lack of good faith in exercising my right to terminate the contract, is ludicrous.

Any damage that Beau suffers due to

termination of the contract is his own fault, because (A) he misled me, and (B) without my consent, he imprudently took actions (e.g., publicity) that committed him to publish the book, and he did so before it had been determined that we would be able to reach agreement about the legal revisions. If he had refrained from initiating any actions relative to the publication of the book until after ~~the~~^{we} had reached agreement, he would have suffered no damage.

*

I will not give any answers, other than short notes, to any further communications from you ~~and~~^{or} from Beau, until after I have filed my brief in my criminal case, which will probably be some time around mid-December.

Sincerely yours,

Theodore J. Kaczynski

P.S. A correction to the last paragraph of Beau's letter to me of 10/29/99: I never requested that Beau change the copy on the front flap of the book-jacket. TJK

P.P.S. What Beau said in the last paragraph of his letter to me of 10/29/99 was a possible interpretation of what I wrote in my letter 89A, page 5, #3 ("please do not say it"), but it was not my intention to ask Beau to reprint the book-jackets. TJK

P.P.P.S. In the last paragraph of his letter of November 1, 1999, Beau possibly means to imply that my decision to terminate the contract was in some way caused by Stephen Dubner's article in Time. This is clearly false. See my letter #87, of October 3, 1999, which predates the appearance of Dubner's article. Letter #87 shows clearly the real source of the difficulty between Beau and me, and it confirms that the real reason why I terminated the contract was precisely what I said it was in my note of October 26: The legal revisions that you demand in Truth versus Lies are far too extensive for me to accept. TJK

P.P.P.S. A further point: This is something that Beau knows well, and therefore you probably know it too, but since there seems to be some evasiveness in this respect on your and Beau's part, I will state the point explicitly in order to put an end to your evasions.

The issue between us is not the wording of the paraphrases and summaries that you want to use. The issue is that you refuse to use the original quoted passages. You say that Context has offered to "work with me," but what you seem to mean is that you will work with me on the wording of the paraphrases and summaries. But at present there would be no point in my working with you on the wording of the paraphrases and summaries, because that is not the issue. The issue is your refusal to use the original

quoted passages, and what we have to negotiate is the amount of original quoted material to be retained.

You may claim that the original quoted material would expose you to excessive risk of a lawsuit. Assuming that that is the case, that is what the termination provision was inserted in the contract for — to give me a way out in case you wanted to delete more quoted material than was acceptable to me, or make other changes that I found unacceptable.

The contract gives me the unqualified right to terminate in preference to accepting revisions of the manuscript. Your claim that good faith requires me to accept revisions that would reduce your legal risk to an acceptable level, would, ^{if accepted,} have the effect of completely nullifying the provision that allows me to terminate, since that provision would never have any plausible application. Thus, your "good faith" argument is just a gimmick for nullifying a provision of the contract that Beau doesn't like. If he doesn't like it, he shouldn't have signed the contract.

One last point: To any argument I may offer you, you will merely reply with sophistries designed to justify your claims. Hence, I will waste no more time arguing these issues with you.

Therefore, if in any future communication of yours, you put forward any type of assertion, claim, or argument, and if I omit to respond to

your assertion, claim or argument, my omission of response will not indicate on my part any acceptance of, or acquiescence in, your assertion, claim, or argument. I simply will not waste my time bandying words with you futilely.

However, I am willing to negotiate with you concerning the amount of original quoted material to be retained in Truth versus Lies, and other similar issues.

Ted Kaczynski

THEO KACZYNSKI
to
JEFFREY MILLER

December 26, 1999

Dear Mr. Miller:

I write in response to your letter of November 18, 1999. At the time I wrote my letter of November 5, 1999, I was unaware of certain statements about me that Mr. Friedlander had made to the media; for example, as reported by Larry McShane in Associated Press dispatches of 11/4/99, 5:06:01 PM Central Standard Time and 11/5/99, 4:28:45 AM Central Standard Time.

It should be obvious to you that I will not do business of any kind with Mr. Friedlander until he has (1) admitted publicly that his statements to the media concerning the reasons for the difficulty between us are highly misleading and give a false impression of my role in the affair; (2) apologized publicly for said statements; (3) admitted publicly that he misled me about the amount of material that his lawyers wanted to delete from my book or replace with paraphrases or summaries; and (4) admitted publicly that the fact that he misled me was the principal source of the difficulty between us.

Until Mr. Friedlander has satisfied these four conditions, I will not carry on discussions of any kind with you or with him.

Yours truly,

Theodore J. Kaczynski